

THE  
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. LII.—APRIL, 1883.

OUTER FEATURES OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY.

THE public ministry of our Lord falls into three main divisions. First, His early ministry in Judea, of which only St. John takes notice, and of which he records but a few incidents. It is plain, however, that our Lord began his work in Jerusalem and the neighbourhood, deeming the ancient capital the right place for Him to present His commission and set up His kingdom; and it was only when John the Baptist was cast into prison, and persecution was manifestly impending on Himself, that "He left Judea and departed into Galilee" (Matt. iv. 12; John iv. 1, 3). Second, His Galilean ministry, occupying probably two years, and embracing three circuits of Galilee, varied by excursions to places more distant, such as the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, and by visits to feasts at Jerusalem. Of this part of His ministry the fullest account is given us by St. Matthew. Third, the ministry after the transfiguration, when His face was set towards Jerusalem, embracing several tours and detours on the way, and after His arrival there. Of the journey towards Jerusalem we have the fullest account in St. Luke; while of the events connected with the last days, the narrative of St. John is the most copious and the most touching.

The whole of this public ministry is commonly believed to have extended to about three years, though opinions have prevailed that it was as short as one year,\* and also that it was considerably longer than three. It is by studying the references to the feasts, mainly as given in the fourth gospel, that we arrive at three years, or perhaps a little more, as the true duration of the ministry. In that brief space, and mainly in the rough, wild province of Galilee, Jesus did a work which changed for all time the complexion of the world's history, and exalted immeasurably the life and the destinies of men.

Keeping in view, then, the shortness of the time occupied in this unexampled work, we notice—

I. First, *the systematic industry, diligence and self-command* which

\* Keim, one of the most recent neological writers on the life of Christ, contends elaborately that the whole public ministry was comprised in one year; to make out his case however, he throws overboard the fourth Gospel.

characterised our Lord from the beginning to the very end. In regard to the Galilean ministry, we are led to understand that His itineracy there embraced, to say the least, a large proportion of its towns and villages. Even when we make allowance for the freedom with which general expressions like "all" and "whole" are often used in Oriental speech, we must hold that the visits were very comprehensive which Matthew thus characterises — "Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people" (ix. 35). We learn from Josephus that in Galilee there were 204 towns and villages, so that if the most of these were embraced in Christ's personal visits, the labour involved must have been very great. The same impression of most abundant labour is derived from the figurative expression of John, that if all the mighty works of Jesus were recorded, the world itself would not be able to contain the books that should be written. Besides several circuits of Galilee, we read of his visiting the remoter north, at Cæsarea Philippi; and the remoter north-west, in the coasts of Tyre and Sidon; we know of his passing oftener than once through Samaria; we know, too, of his being on the east side of Jordan, and coming up from the Jordan valley by Jericho; and we are familiar with his frequent visits to Jerusalem. Strange to say, the only districts of the country where we do not read of his having been during his public ministry are, that classical region of the Old Testament—the tribe of Judah, embracing his own birthplace, Bethlehem, as well as Hebron and Beersheba, the haunts of the patriarchs; and likewise the Shephelah, or maritime plain, embracing the land of the Philistines and the plain of Sharon. But though there be no record of such visits, it does not follow that none took place.

Throughout every part of the wide district which He traversed, He not only preached, taught, and healed, but He had numberless collisions with opponents; He lived under constant apprehensions of attack, whether by fraud or violence; He carried on the work of instructing and training the apostles; and in their slowness of heart, want of faith, childishness and paltry strifes, He encountered a serious addition to His burdens, although it would be harsh to suppose that, on the whole, their company did not afford Him both refreshment and aid. From His nature being so communicative and social, Jesus enjoyed society; and with all their failings, these rough but honest and warm-hearted fisher-lads must, on the whole, have been a real acquisition. The strain on the bodily energies in a life involving so much movement and labour must have been very great; still greater must have been the strain on the mind, where there was so much excitement, and where interests so serious were at stake. From the fact that the Jews spoke of fifty years as the limit of age which He had not passed, although He might be approaching it (John viii. 57), it is probable that He had acquired that

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

older look which is commonly produced by a great mental and bodily strain.

Through all this immense labour, our Lord appears to have passed with quite marvellous calmness and self-possession. From the narrative of His life nothing is more remote than the air of bustle and hurry; there is indeed about it a wonderful aspect as of Oriental calm and leisure. Though we read of His resting through exhaustion at Jacob's Well; of His being with His disciples so pressed by the multitude that they had no time so much as to eat bread; of His having to get into a boat to escape the pressure; and of His inviting His disciples to come into a desert place and rest a while—there is no trace of flutter or discomposure; His movements are as orderly and deliberate as if He had enjoyed the most ample leisure.

It is evident that this diligence and industry must have been the effect of a remarkable power of arrangement. It has been remarked that the faculty of order was quite a feature of the Hebrew mind.\* It was conspicuous in Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Gideon, David, Solomon, Ezra, Nehemiah, and a host of other Hebrews. It is very remarkable in our Lord. We see it in the symmetrical character of His discourses; we see it in the mission of the Twelve and of the Seventy; we trace it in some of His allusions, as when He supposes a man about to build a tower sitting down to calculate whether he has money enough to finish it, or a king going out to war considering whether his ten thousand are a match for his opponent's twenty; we see it moreover in the miracle of the loaves and fishes, and in the instructions to the two disciples for celebrating the Passover; in a word, we see it in every arrangement of our Lord's public life. That our Lord worked by system, and could not otherwise have got through His work, is plain as noonday to all who know the difference between systematic and random working. It may be thought a mechanical way of work; hours and laws, we may be told, were made for slaves; and it may be extolled as a higher life when one obeys the impulse of the hour, and is free to catch and follow whatever gales of inspiration may at any time come upon one. No doubt one may be bound by lines too hard and too fast; and for our part we deem a little elasticity an advantage in any system,—a power of readily adapting it to emergencies as they arise. But those who are habitually systematic will probably find that they come to be comparatively independent of fitful impulses and inspirations, and that their faculties come to them, to use Milton's phrase, as nimble servitors, when their aid is sought.

We hold then that we may well claim our Lord as showing the value of system as an aid to the spirit of industry in labour. And partly, no doubt, through this habit, He was habitually *beforehand* with His work. He was always ready. His discourses have a wonderfully finished air, as if they had been matured before they were spoken. His very answers to casual objectors were marvellously clean-cut and finished.

\* See Isaac Taylor's "Remarks on Colenso's Strictures on the Pentateuch."

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.

He was never disconcerted or at a loss how to answer or to act. His presence of mind never deserted him, and what is very remarkable, He never allowed one thing to jostle another in His mind, however full it may have been of projects, and however burdened with anxieties.

This marvellous orderliness and business-like composure comes out strikingly in connection with the last scenes of His life. Who can conceive the burden that was then pressing on His soul? Yet nothing could exceed the deliberate forethought and systematic regularity with which everything was planned and arranged. There are instances in private life familiar to us all, of dying persons giving minute directions about their funeral, or of persons struck by a sudden calamity thinking as calmly of the details of necessary business as if no such blow had fallen. But no instance can approach the case of our Lord. Calmly and minutely He describes to the two disciples the arrangements to be made for keeping the Passover. Assembled with the Twelve, he deliberately girds himself, pours water into a basin, washes the feet of the disciples, deals with the objections of Peter, explains the figurative import of the act, and enforces the example which it supplies. With equal calmness He institutes the holiest of the mysteries of the Christian religion, giving calm utterance to the few but memorable words which were to be repeated on the most solemn occasions in the history of His Church till His second coming, and to be the vehicle of the most profound impressions of salvation through His blood. Then, with a courage which none can know who have never needed to break in on the peace of a gathering of friends by some appalling announcement, He exposes the treachery of Judas. With equal calmness He rebukes the confidence of Peter. If any documents in the world bear the stamp of self-possession and repose, it is the farewell address and the intercessory prayer. But the agony in the Garden lets us see what a hurricane was raging, and how great was the effort needed to maintain the calm. On the cross, we have renewed evidence both of the conflict and the victory. What a power of thinking of others did He show all through these last scenes!—Uttering a discourse so full of consolation; offering such a prayer; healing the ear of Malchus; casting that look of tender rebuke on Peter; bidding the daughters of Jerusalem weep not for Him but for themselves and for their children; praying for His murderers; gladdening the heart of the penitent thief; committing His mother with so simple kindness to the care of John; and leaving as his last legacy to the faith of His disciples that glorious word, *Τετέλεσται*, it is finished!

In fine, in our Lord's whole demeanour on this memorable occasion, we see the triumph of two things—the power of a well-ordered mind to give its whole attention to the proper business of each moment,—not to let duties or occupations jostle one another, not to let the shadow of the more distant disturb the more immediate; and, second, the power of a noble mind to throw off consciousness of itself even when its case



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

might seem all-absorbing—the triumph of a mind, as the hymn puts it, “at leisure from itself, to soothe and sympathise.”

II. Another prominent feature of our Lord's ministry was his *naturalness and variety of method*.

Speech having been His great instrument of instruction, He made use of it in many forms. Discourses, parables, proverbs, texts of Scripture, conversation, controversy, were among the forms of speech in which He addressed men. The places where He spoke showed a like variety. In the synagogue, in the temple, in the street, on mountains, in plains, in private houses, at the dining-table, at the bedside, at the well-side, at the seaside, by the wayside, from the boat-side; in journeys by land, in journeys by sea, He spoke the word of God. Now He defended Himself from the misrepresentations of opponents, and now He assumed the offensive, and by well-planted blows exposed their hollowness and hypocrisy. *Semper, ubique, omnibus*, might have been His motto; for the word of God was a burning fire shut up in His bones, and He could not stay.

Here, however, one remarks an apparent exception—our Lord *wrote* nothing. There is no evidence of His having ever reduced permanently to writing so much as a single scrap. The only mention of His writing is His writing on the ground when the woman was brought to Him charged with adultery. The epistle to Abgarus, king of Edessa, mentioned by some early writers, is now universally given up, though learned doctors, and even bishops, have in their day contended for its genuineness. Even if it were otherwise, it is too trifling a production to make any real exception. But though Christ wrote nothing personally, He virtually wrote much. *Qui facit per alterum, facit per se*. His spoken words were destined to be changed into written words. No one who reflects on the extent and exhaustiveness of our Lord's personal labours will wonder that, in the brief period of His ministry, He confined Himself to oral teaching. He knew that His life and His work would not want historians, and that trustworthy records would be written that would carry them down to the end of time. He had marvellous faith in the permanence of His words though unrecorded by Him. Heaven and earth would pass away, but His words, though then unwritten, would not pass away. He could assure His disciples that the loving act of the woman who had anointed Him would be proclaimed wherever His Gospel should come.

But amid all His variety of method He was singularly unconventional. He did not adhere to consecrated places, nor canonical hours, nor professional methods. He did not seek the shelter of professional propriety, delivering a serious discourse when it was deemed the right thing to do, and at other times conforming to the spirit of the world, and conducting Himself simply as an agreeable member of worldly society. What He taught in public He was earnest to impress in private. He was instant in season, out of season; and the state

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

of mind that made Him so was the great secret of His power. Even the world has little respect for the mere professional preacher. One who speaks from his brief is little thought of compared to one who speaks from his heart. And the man that speaks from his heart cannot confine himself to mere public occasions—he cannot but speak what he has seen and heard.

No doubt, in a settled state of things there is something to be said for conventionality. But there is little to be said for the man that can serve his Master only in conventional ways. He is tempted to lose sight of his Master altogether. He is liable to forget the great end at which he ought to aim. To go through the allotted routine of “duty,” more or less respectably as he may be able, is his main concern. Whether he may not in this way be wasting half his energies or more; whether by methods more simple, more direct, more Christ-like he might not accomplish much more good, is no question for him. He does the work which he is required to do, and that satisfies his conscience. But does it satisfy his Master? Is there not much for us to think of and to try to follow in that free, unconventional method of influencing others of which our Lord sets us so high an example? Have not all great evangelists, all successful ministers, followed it more or less? And in reference to the two ways of work in these settled times, conventional and unconventional, may not a combination of both be the rule incumbent on us, as if our Master repeated to us His own words, “These ought ye to do, and not to leave the other undone”?

III. Not less remarkable, among the outer features of our Lord's ministry, was its *combination of apparently opposite qualities*.

1. Thus, first, we find it combining quite remarkably the *popular* and the *profound*. The whole style of His ministry was popular—matter, manner, and form. He never spoke as a metaphysician; dealt not in “abstract and concrete,” “subjective and objective,” “positive and negative,” or in any scholastic terms or forms whatever. Yet His teaching was profound in the truest sense and highest degree. It went right to the heart of things, and brought out, clear and strong, their profoundest lessons. One might elaborate the idea of God's fatherhood through philosophical volumes, without settling the matter for ever as Jesus did by His happy “how much more”:—“If ye that are evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in Heaven give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?” His allusion to the lilies as they grow brought out the right and privilege of children to repose in the thoughtful care of the great Father in a way that, instead of bitter anxiety, fills one's heart with repose and expectation. “No man can serve two masters” solves a thousand questions of casuistry, as it exposes at the same time a thousand hollow schemes of life where men vainly strive to achieve the impossible. It was in the application of Divine truth to the human heart that Christ showed such profundity,—that He so surely and steadily hit the nail

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

upon the head. Other teachers might say on a subject much that was good and true ; but Christ brought out its very pith and marrow, presenting it with a clearness that no understanding could refuse, and with a force that no conscience could withstand.

2. Similar to this combination is that of *homeliness* and *sublimity*. The whole tenor of His conversations and discourses was homely ; His illustrations were drawn from the commonest sights of earth, and the homeliest occupations of men. The pursuits of the farmer and the fisherman, the builder and the vinedresser, the shepherd whose sheep had wandered, the woman that had lost her piece of silver, furnished texts for His parables and discourses. Yet with these homely illustrations, to what heights He rose ! What glorious truths He brought down from heaven by means of the lost sheep, the lost piece of silver, and the prodigal son ! Who would have thought that a poor woman's pleasure in recovering a trifling coin could be allied to feelings that thrill the hearts of angels, and in some sense refresh the soul of God Himself ? Who would have found, in the homely task of the shepherd dividing his sheep from the goats, a picture of that dread scene when small and great shall stand before the great white Throne to receive the deeds done in the body ? Or who would have supposed that their treatment of some poor dirty outcast was to be elevated to the level of the King Himself, and to be greeted with the strange announcement, "I was a stranger and ye took Me in ?" What hands but those of Christ could thus weave the homely and the sublime into the same web ?

3. Combination of *earnestness* and *tact*.—Usually earnestness is impetuous, rushing at its object ; tact is cool and careful, picking its steps with dainty deliberation. But in Christ there was a remarkable combination of both—of the cool head and the burning heart ; the calmness of deliberation and the fervour of zeal. His very soul goes out in His lament over Jerusalem—"How often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not !" Yet observe what tact He shows, for example, in His way of approaching the woman of Samaria. The first thing He does is to ask a favour of her—"Give me to drink." What a knowledge of human nature is shown in this ! If anyone thinks that you are looking down on him, the best way to conciliate him is to ask a small favour of him, for in doing so you make yourself for the moment his inferior ; you show a sense of dependence on him ; you pay him a kind of deference that pleases and thus conciliates him. Have we not seen some rude, wild boy of the street pleased when we approached him respectfully, and asked him if he could tell us where a neighbour lived ; have we not seen him bound before us to the very top of some high stair, much gratified at being asked to be our guide ? Consider, in the like way, our Lord's tact in dealing with Simon the leper. As Simon sees the woman in his house washing Jesus' feet, a little tumult gathers in his breast. Christ does not attack it at once to show its unreasonable-

ness. He looks inquiringly at his host, and says, "Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee." To what magical secret do these words owe their tranquillising power? To the tact that first asks leave, as it were, to speak when something like reproof is to be administered; and then to the further exercise of tact that puts the reproof in a parable, and that asks Simon himself to give judgment in the case. In fact, Simon administers his own reproof. Even the subtle power of so small a thing as repeating a person's name, in order to make a reproof more tender, does not escape the notice of Jesus—"Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things;" "Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to have you;" "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, . . . but ye would not."

4. Combination of *faithfulness* and *kindliness*. He could be kind to the sinner while He detested and rebuked his sin. Pharisaism confounded these two things, and vindicated its contemptuous treatment of the sinner on the ground of the vileness of his sin. And there is always some tendency to this where the sinner's besetting sin is of a repulsive and provoking character. In the case of Jesus it is otherwise; He receives the sinner to His heart, and He dies for his sin. This union of faithfulness and kindliness was evinced on many occasions of His earthly life. We see it in the case of the young man who had great possessions, on whom Christ looked with such affection, but to whom He presented a test of such stringent severity, in order to show him that He did not really love His neighbour as Himself. We see it in the case of the woman with the issue of blood, in whom true faith and gross superstition were so strangely blended—Jesus at once rebuking her superstition, and rewarding her faith. We see it in His treatment of publicans and sinners; He did not shrink from being called their friend, yet every feeling of His soul was against their wickedness, and He never ceased to testify that unless they were converted, they could not see the kingdom of heaven.

5. Combination of *power to enlighten honest inquirers*, and *reprove dishonest cavillers*. The one He advanced to further knowledge of the kingdom of God; the other, incapable through the rebellion of their hearts of appreciating or even understanding the order of the kingdom, He showed the more clearly to deserve condemnation. This double purpose, as He Himself told His disciples, was the occasion of some of His parables. They presented truth under a veil, sufficiently transparent for the eager heart to penetrate, but not transparent enough for the careless and even hostile caviller. There was light enough to attract the honest inquirer, and dimness enough to scare away the worldly mind. Here, it is plain, our Lord took up ground of His own; a task so judicial is not laid on His followers. Our duty is to make the vision plain to all, that he may run that readeth; it is not for us to determine to whom we shall be the savour of life to life, and to whom the savour of death to death.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

6. Combination of *humility* and *majesty*. Is there need for illustration here? The homely, unassuming bearing of our Lord in all the relations of life is one of the great charms of His character. Yet how boundless His claims to honour! "Before Abraham was, I am." "I and my Father are one." "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." With what calm but high dignity, too, did our Lord exercise His powers and dispense His gifts. "I will, be thou clean." "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." "Lazarus, come forth." With all His homeliness there is a profound sense of His personal dignity, and a sublime consciousness of power. "We were witnesses of His majesty," says Peter, "when we were with Him on the mount." Here, too, our glorious Lord stands in a position all His own. We gaze on Him across an infinite gulf. Yet even here the combination has features for our imitation. There is an essential dignity in the office of a Christian minister, not to be sacrificed to the spirit of good fellowship, or geniality, or jesting. It imposes a certain restraint on our mirthful and frivolous moods. While we follow Christ in being among our people as one that serveth, we are to follow Him in never forgetting our relation to the kingdom of God. Avoiding the extremes of lordly arrogance and frivolous familiarity; magnifying our office, yet making ourselves of no reputation—we are to try to combine the spirit of two apparently opposite functions—servants of servants, and ambassadors of the great King.

IV. We note a fourth general feature of our Lord's ministry—its *catholicity*. This quality is apparent not only in the wide-reaching hints and instructions as to the extent of His kingdom which He gave from time to time, but likewise in His bearing towards the different classes of society with whom He came into contact at home. Himself a man of the people, he had all that sympathy with the toiling multitude which gains their affection, and draws their respect and confidence. A son of labour, He could throw out His invitation with the thrilling power of one who understood what weariness meant—"Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Yet, while full of this fellow-feeling for the children of toil, He had no recoil from the other classes of society, and no want of will to help them and to bless them when they showed a desire to enjoy His gifts. The nobleman at Cana, the centurion at Capernaum, the Pharisee that entertained Him in his house, Zaccheus the rich publican of Jericho, Nicodemus who came to Him by night, the lawyer who asked what he should do to inherit eternal life, were all regarded by Jesus with interest and affection. Utterly indifferent to their wealth, and having no vestige of desire for any part of it, He simply looked on them as men and brothers, groaning under the curse of Adam, and as much in need of the grace of God as the most miserable outcast. And thus the ministry of Christ has this feature—it is specially attractive to the burden-bearing mass, but it is not repulsive to any section of the social



[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

community. "The common people heard Him gladly;" but no class of people as such could find anything to repel them. And in point of fact, the religion of Christ has never been confined to one class or section. It has sustained its early character throughout. While offering special attractions to the poor, and while finding not only the largest number but the largest proportion of its adherents among them, it has never wanted representatives—and often they have been very noble representatives—from the cultured, the leisurely, the wealthy sections of society. It is a religion alike for sage and savage, for prince and peasant, for barbarian, Scythian, bond and free. And when it reaches its final triumphs, the kings of the earth shall be seen bringing their glory and honour into the New Jerusalem. Not only the hereditary or other rulers of this territory or of that, but kings in a higher sense,—the kings of intellect, the kings of art, the kings of literature, the kings of eloquence, the kings of social and spiritual influence. Many a voice will blend in that lofty anthem, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing."

W. G. BLAICKIE.

## THE IMPERIAL HOUSE OF HOHENZOLLERN AND ITS REFORMED\* CREED.

IT was on Christmas-day, 1613, that in his chapel at Cologne on the Spree, John Sigismund, the Elector of Brandenburg, took the Holy Communion according to the rites and doctrines of the Reformed Church, together with his brother the Margrave of Jaegerndorf, Count Ernest Casimir of Nassau, and some of the Elector's courtiers, noblemen, and councillors. His brother Ernest, at that time governor of Cleve and Berg, had done the same thing six months before. At the same time, as it was then the custom, the Elector published his creed, known by the name of "Sigismund's Confession" (*Confessio Sigismundi, s. Marchica*), and from that time the Hohenzollern family have adhered to the creed which their ancestor adopted, having been previously strong followers of the Lutheran confession, laid down in the "Concordia." But what could have been the Sigismund's motive in taking this step?

The Lutheran subjects of the Elector felt hurt at the change; they even revolted against their sovereign. He had changed his confession, they said, to gain the friendship of the authorities in the Netherlands, and their help against the Spaniards, who would not allow him to take possession of the territories on the Rhine which he had inherited after

\* Our readers will note that the term "Reformed" is used in opposition to "Lutheran," and as nearly equivalent to Calvinistic or Presbyterian.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

the death of the last duke of Jülich-Cleve-Berg. These and other reproaches the Lutherans repeat even in our day.

But there is no reason for doubt that his only motive was his own conscientious conviction which he felt obliged to follow. The Spaniards, it is true, as well as the German Emperor and the whole popish party of that age, disputed his right to the above-mentioned territories. They were all disposed in favour of his competitor, the Count-Palatine of Neuburg, especially after the latter had abjured his Protestant faith and become a Papist. But is there any reason for concluding that the Elector could have had no other motive for adopting the Reformed Creed than the wish to please the Netherlands, and to obtain their assistance? To gain the good-will of the authorities of Amsterdam and the Hague against the King of Spain and the Austrians, it was unnecessary for him to adopt their creed; it was the interest of the Prince of Orange as well as of Barneveldt and the States-General to hinder their mortal enemy from extending his power on the banks of the Rhine. But if the Elector had been faithless enough to change his confession only for temporal interests, he could have done what the Count-Palatine really did,—adopt the Roman Catholic Creed, and become a pupil of the Jesuits. No doubt, the Emperor of Germany, as well as the King of Spain, would then have acknowledged the Elector as (what he really was) the only legitimate heir of the late Duke of Cleve; moreover, the Jesuits would have shown him the same care as they displayed towards the Count-Palatine, and he would not have failed to gain much worldly profit. By going over to the Reformed Church, however, he not only offended the Emperor and the whole Popish party, which was most powerful at that time, but he also offended the Lutherans and their leader, the Elector of Saxony; he even offended his own subjects in Brandenburg and in Prussia, on whose good-will he had to rely if he wished to gain the victory over his adversaries in the Rhenish territories.

There is evidence enough to prove that the Elector's change of creed was really a matter of conscience. Even while not much more than a boy, there were disagreements between him and his grandfather, John George, a strong and exclusive adherent of the Book of Concord, on account of the young prince's inclination to the doctrines of the Reformed Church. The grandfather, incited by the prince's governor, the Lutheran zealot Dr. Gedicke, even constrained his grandson to sign a document, in which he was made to promise that he would never compel his subjects to change their confession, as the German princes used to do, following the maxim, "*Cujus regio, ejus religio.*" It is possible that the blind passion of Dr. Gedicke against the "Calvinists" was the very thing that caused the young prince to examine the doctrines of the "condemned heretics" most carefully, and thus to find the reality quite different from the dark picture of the Lutheran zealot. Some years later, after the death of his grandfather, his father (the kind-hearted and unprejudiced Joachim Frederic) sent his son to the Court

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

of Heidelberg, where he met with strong adherents of the Reformed Church, which the Lutheran clergy of Berlin called the "Synagogue of Satan." It is not astonishing that his candour led him to become the friend of a Church whose doctrines rest on the only legitimate foundation, the Scriptures, and which has no other desire but to conform the life and behaviour of her members entirely to that standard. John Sigismond himself assures us that nothing but his conscience caused him to give up the Lutheran doctrines for those of the Reformed Church. Some days before that remarkable Christmas, on the 18th of December, he assembled the clergy of Berlin and Cologne on the Spree, and announced his resolution to them, in the presence of his brother, the Margrave of Jaegerndorf, and his privy-councillors, adding that his motive for the change was the desire to set his conscience at peace. He did nothing that could make us doubt his sincerity.

But we do not intend to enter here more closely into this question. There is another which we would like to handle; namely, the effect of this proceeding as regards public affairs, especially Church matters in Germany as well as in all Europe. It will not be difficult to prove that John Sigismond, by confessing himself a member of the Reformed Church, produced a most wholesome change, not only in Prussia, but also in Germany, and even throughout the whole Christian world. Above all we must acknowledge that the Elector of Brandenburg, by making the Reformed Creed the confession of his family, procured for our Church that protection without which it would undoubtedly have been exterminated in Germany. It is true that in the year 1613, when John Sigismond changed his Confession, there was still another protector of the Reformed Church in Germany, the Elector-Palatine at Heidelberg, powerful enough to defend his brethren against the hatred of the Papists as well as of the Lutherans, both of whom were then furiously enraged against those whom they called "Sacramentarians." The Palatinate was at that time the leading power among those who professed the Reformed Creed. Though their antagonists, the Lutherans no less than the Papists, wished to suppress our Church,\* they did not venture to execute their bloody intentions everywhere, so long as the Count-Palatine Elector stood firm. When Frederic III., called the Pious, established the Reformed Church within his dominions by publishing the Heidelberg Catechism, the Lutheran princes of Germany did not hesitate to accuse him to the Emperor for having given up the Augsburg Confession in favour of "accursed Calvinism." But they dared not lay hands on him, and under his shelter the Reformed Church flourished in the western parts of Germany. A considerable time, however, passed before the Palgrave was powerful

\* They did so, indeed, with the utmost cruelty, wherever they had power; as, for instance, in Saxony, where not only the friends of the Calvinistic doctrines, but also those of Melancthon, were driven out by violence, or treated like criminals.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

enough to protect the Reformed. Six years after that Christmas Day, Frederic V., the "Winter King," was defeated by the leaguers in the fatal battle at the White Mountain, near Prague, and lost not only the new crown of Bohemia, but also the old electoral hat of the Palatinate. The Duke of Bavaria, his relation (but nevertheless his most zealous adversary and the mortal enemy of Protestantism), who had defeated him at Prague, was made Elector in his stead, by the grateful emperor. Frederic, forsaken also by his own father-in-law, James I. of England, was compelled to live far from his estates in the Netherlands. But in these circumstances, what would have been the fate of the Reformed Church, at least in Germany, had there not been another power mighty enough to defend her?

There were, it is true, some other princes in Germany, who professed the Reformed doctrines,—the princes of Anhalt and of Nassau, the Count of Lippe, some Rhenish princes, the magistrates of Bremen and Emden, and, most powerful of all, the Landgrave of Hesse. But, were these strong enough to resist their Popish and Lutheran adversaries when they resolved to extirpate the Reformed Church within the empire? What they were able to do was exemplified in Paderborn and many other German territories, where the Papists or the Lutherans succeeded in entirely exterminating the Reformed Confession.

At the close of the sixteenth century, the town and country of Paderborn had adopted the doctrines of Protestantism, and it appeared as if the Papists would never again be able to raise their heads. Nevertheless, though the Landgrave of Hesse stood on the one side of the country, and the Count of Lippe, then commander-in-chief of the Westphalian district, on the other, they were unable to defend the Protestant Burgomaster of Paderborn, the brave Wigard, from being quartered by the victorious Jesuits, and Protestantism in that country from being exterminated by fire and sword. But one could name many towns and territories besides Paderborn which were forced to renounce their Protestant faith by the violence of those who thought it a meritorious work thus to increase the power of the Pope.

But what would have become of all these little Reformed congregations, scattered especially throughout the western regions of Germany, if the Lutheran and Popish powers would no longer allow them to exist? They would certainly have been broken like a reed, by the hurricane which laid waste the whole of Germany—the dreadful Thirty Years' War. There could have been no hope that the great Reformed power which was established on the frontiers of Germany, the States-General, would have been able to protect them against the combined Spanish, Popish, and Lutheran malevolence. It is even doubtful whether the Dutch Republic itself would have been powerful enough to withstand the storm after all these little Reformed Churches in the neighbourhood had been destroyed; and this the more, as the great northern power, Sweden, which took part in the war in order to protect the German Protestants

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

was by no means favourable to the "Calvinistic" creed. Charles IX., it is true, had founded his church-book on the Heidelberg Catechism, and had in this way adopted the chief principles of the Reformed Church, but Lutheranism afterwards prevailed in the Swedish Church, and Oxenstierna, the chancellor of the northern realm, agreed with the Saxon Elector, that "Calvinism" ought to be extirpated throughout the world.

But just at this time the Prince of Hohenzollern, by adopting the Reformed creed, saved this Church from being entirely extirpated. While the leading Reformed prince on the banks of the Rhine, the Elector Palatine, had his power broken and was then forsaken for his "Calvinistic heresy" by those who ought to have been his natural allies, the power of the Hohenzollern in the north-eastern part of Germany was increased by gaining Prussia as well as the dominions in Westphalia and on the banks of the Rhine. These brought the Elector of Brandenburg into near connection with the Dutch Republic; and with that skilful circumspection by which the Hohenzollern princes have ever distinguished themselves, they resolved to maintain the Reformed creed, not only for political, but also conscientious reasons.

During these dreadful thirty years, when the Protestant princes of Germany forsook one another, each thinking only of the best means to increase his own power at the expense of his neighbour, the Brandenburg Elector, George William, son of Sigismund, cautiously stood aside, trying to ward off war as much as possible from his frontiers. He has often enough been accused of cowardice, and of having forsaken the common cause of Protestantism. But as for the "common cause of Protestantism," did such a thing exist in Germany at that time? When the Elector of Saxony, the great champion of Lutheranism, long before the war broke out, accused his neighbour at Berlin of apostacy; when he entreated the Emperor to proclaim the Elector of Brandenburg an outlaw for having given up the true unvaried Augsburg Confession, and to trust him (the Elector of Saxony) with the execution,—was there, in such circumstances, anything like a "common cause of Protestantism"? And, when the Elector of Brandenburg considered how Frederic V., the "Winter King" of Bohemia, had been forsaken by the Lutheran princes, when he saw that the head of Lutheranism was negotiating again and again with the Popish court of the Emperor against those who adhered to the Gospel without being followers of the "Form of Concord," was there still a "common cause" between him and Saxony? This being the case, could it be right to blame him for having preferred to take care of his own affairs, and not place his dominions at stake? We must also add that many of his possessions were very uncertain. His right to Prussia, which had fallen to him a few years before, after the death of the last duke, was disputed by the king and the Diet of Poland, as well as by the nobility of the country itself; and, as for the possessions on the Rhine, who does not know that they formed the ground of



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

contention between himself on the one hand, and the Emperor, the King of Spain, the Palgrave of Neuburg, and the Elector of Saxony, his "faithful and sincere neighbour," on the other? Even in his own family he had adversaries for the sake of his "Calvinism"; his mother, Anna of Prussia, intrigued with the Saxon Court to depose him. What else could he do but keep peace when the whole world was against him, and when, by taking part in the war, he could only expect to lose?

After his death, his successor, "the Great Elector," as he is called by his grateful people, a young man of undaunted courage, also refrained from entering the conflict, but endeavoured to heal the wounds which the war had inflicted on his subjects, and to form an alliance among the Reformed powers on the Continent. From Prussia, where the war had not been raging, he brought corn and cattle to the Brandenburg territories, and helped the peasants to rebuild their villages. His army, which had been utterly destroyed, was renewed, and with the States-General, as well as with the Landgrave of Hesse and the other Reformed princes, he succeeded in concluding a treaty obliging them to defend each other against every attempt that might be made to attack their possessions or creed. This alliance was absolutely necessary; for the enmity against the Reformed was so great that, while negotiating about the peace of Münster and Osnabrück, the Papists and the Lutherans agreed to extirpate the Reformed Church within the empire.

The Emperor on the one hand, and the Swede together with the Saxon on the other, had intended to secure that only two Confessions should exist in Germany—the "Catholic," as they called it, and the Lutheran; while the "Calvinists" were to be made outlaws, and the princes who adhered to the Reformed Church expelled from the empire and deprived of their dominions. The Saxon and the Swede, as well as the Emperor and the other Popish princes, had no other intention than to increase their own possessions by plundering the "heretics." The Elector of Saxony had long before shown a great desire for the countries of his "dear cousin," the Elector of Brandenburg, and "Christian faith" was to be the pretext for these very unchristian intrigues. Then, however, the Great Elector threatened to continue the war at all hazards rather than allow them to oppress his conscience and that of his allies. So great was his power and the respect paid to him, that they conceded what he demanded for the Reformed Church—viz., the same rights as the two other Churches; and from that time the Hohenzollern princes made it their duty to be the true, steadfast protectors of the Reformed Churches.

When, after having been made Elector Palatine, the Palgrave of Neuburg and his Jesuits cruelly persecuted the members of the Reformed Church within the dominions of Frederick III., the Elector of Brandenburg and King of Prussia interfered in favour of his brethren in the faith. When the King of France, Louis XIV., tried to convert his Reformed subjects, by means of his dragoons, to that Church which

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

arrogantly calls herself the only one in which salvation can be found, the Great Elector opened his dominions to the refugees ; while the Lutheran princes, especially the Saxon, would not even allow them to pass through their dominions. When the Bishop of Salzburg cruelly oppressed the adherents of the Gospel within his territories, Frederic William I., King of Prussia, became the advocate of these poor victims of sacerdotal hatred, and, compelling their tormentors to allow them to leave his country, offered them a new home within his own realms. The Reformed Church of Hanover still preserves, as a precious document, a letter from the same King of Prussia, in which he assured that congregation of his protection in all circumstances. Whenever the Reformed Church was in danger of being suppressed, the Hohenzollern princes thought it their duty to defend it. No injury was too severe to inflict, and no accusation too absurd for the Lutherans to utter against those who refused to make Luther their Pope. But neither George William nor the Great Elector intended to allow this. The Lutherans, they said, shall have entire liberty in our territories to follow their own conscience, but we shall by no means suffer them publicly to offend those who have other convictions. The Great Elector for many years took the greatest pains to conciliate these implacable enemies of his own creed. He arranged colloquies between the two Protestant parties, one at Thorn, others at Berlin, hoping that an agreement might be reached. But when the Lutherans showed themselves quite irreconcilable, he used his power as sovereign, and interdicted these "guards of Zion" from committing any offence against the Reformed creed or those who professed it. Moreover, because the magistrates of the cities in Brandenburg and Prussia, instigated by the Lutheran clergy and insisting on their privileges, would not permit the Reformed preachers to assemble their brethren publicly, the Great Elector, without injuring the rights of the Lutherans in any way, installed his own chaplains in those inhospitable localities, and took the religious services of the Reformed under his special personal protection. Up to the present these preachers have retained the title of Court-chaplains.

It was a very strange and satisfactory turn which affairs had taken. Not only did the Reformed Church in this way receive a new powerful and faithful protector just after having lost its former champion, but the Lutherans also soon found themselves compelled to take refuge with the "cursed Calvinist" at Berlin. The Elector of Saxony, on whom they had relied so long, desired to gain the crown of Poland, and followed the example of the Count-Palatine of Neuburg by going over to Popery. From that time the Hohenzollern princes regarded themselves as the natural guardians of the Protestant Church in Germany. At the diet of Ratisbon there was a special commission called "*corpus evangelicorum*," whose task was to care for the interests of all Protestant Churches within the German dominions. When the Elector of Saxony

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

had entirely relinquished Protestantism, the king of Prussia was the only member of this body who was powerful enough to command the respect of the Roman Catholic princes. But no case had occurred in which the king of Prussia did not as sincerely interest himself in behalf of the Lutherans as the Reformed. He acknowledged it his natural duty to be the protector of the whole Protestant Church, and the Lutherans soon felt compelled to praise his impartiality.

John Sigismund's action on that eventful Christmas Day had another consequence; a change took place in the leading principles concerning the management of Church affairs, which we cannot help calling the most important that has occurred since the days of the Reformation. If, up to that time, the principle of *uniformity* had been followed by all who had to deal with ecclesiastical affairs—by the Protestant powers as well as by the Papists—John Sigismund was the first to proclaim that his ruling principle was to be *parity* of the different Confessions within the same territory and under the same temporal government.

Up to that time, a very different maxim had been followed; this was expressed in the words "*cujus regio, ejus religio*;" he who had the temporal power in the territory was also entitled to decide which religion was to rule within his dominions; and the creed of the subjects had to be conformed to that of their sovereign. Within every dominion, large or small, only one religion was allowed to exist, and those who would not agree to this could leave the country; such was the arrangement everywhere. This principle, whose consequences were so dangerous to all Dissenters, was first established at the Peace of Augsburg (1555). Those who introduced it were no other than the Jesuits; nevertheless the Protestant princes adopted it willingly. The Jesuits had no other intention than to gain the power to extirpate Protestantism from all those territories in which the bishops and abbots—of whom there were a great many since the time of Henry II., called the "Saint"—had also the dignity of sovereigns. Wherever they could, they have practised this maxim in the most cruel manner. Within the Ecclesiastical States, Protestantism was regarded as a crime. From the end of the sixteenth to the eighteenth century the Reformation was suppressed by fire and sword in nearly half of those German territories in which it had previously been established—always by enforcing that ominous doctrine, that the creed of the people should be conformed to that of the Government. So was it in the Bishoprics of Paderborn and Cologne, in the Eichsfeld, in Bohemia and Austria, and in the Palatinate after the Neuburg family inherited that unfortunate country. But in the same way also the Protestant princes adopted the maxim because they thought it right to augment their power, and they employed it in the same regardless and cruel way as the Jesuits, not only against the Papists, but also against those Protestants who did not in every point agree with that form of creed which they had adopted. Thus, when the Elector of Saxony, Augustus I., introduced the "*Formula Con-*

VOL. IX.—NO. LII.

S

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

*cordia*” into the Church of his dominions, not only the “Calvinists,” but also the “Philippists”—the peaceable followers of Melancthon—were driven away, imprisoned, or even beheaded. The same thing happened wherever the Government had adopted the Concordia of Kloster Bergen near Magdeburg; everyone who hesitated to sign it, whether a clergyman or an officer of the temporal power, was at least forced to leave the country. Even the grandfather of John Sigismund, the strong-hearted John George, pursued the same course; implacable against all Dissenters, he deemed it a personal affront if any of his subjects dared to differ in opinion from him—the master of the territory. “Uniformity” was the rule everywhere, and not only in Germany; it was enforced in Spain, in Italy, in France, especially during the reign of Louis XIV., and in England. The struggles in which the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was so long engaged to secure its existence were caused by the application of this fatal principle, which makes no distinction between unity and uniformity, and does not understand that concord may exist without strict agreement concerning outward forms. The first who renounced this maxim and adopted the contrary—parity instead of uniformity—was John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg.

As for himself, his only desire was to afford equal protection. This important maxim, laid down by the Elector, was at that time so unprecedented that not only the German princes, but also the Elector's own subjects revolted, and the Elector of Saxony accused him to the Emperor of having apostatised from the Augsburg Confession. Nearly the whole empire, except the Reformed princes, became his enemies. But, fortunately, he showed himself immovable, and he as well as his successors made it their duty and the principal object of their Church politics, to maintain this maxim.

The Church, it cannot be denied, did not immediately comprehend its duty in this matter. On the contrary, the Lutheran clergy, not only of Berlin but also of the whole monarchy of Prussia, as well as of Brandenburg, attacked the Elector in a most violent manner. But as a conscientious man, he inflexibly maintained his principle—parity of the Confessions, and the same right to each in the same commonwealth.

While Louis XIV. of France tormented his Reformed subjects, and compelled them either to acknowledge the Pope as their spiritual head or to leave his dominions—maintaining that nobody in his realm should have a creed different from his own—the Great Elector patiently endured all the insolence with which the Lutheran preachers did not cease to attack him. It was the merit of Frederic William to make the principle of parity the immovable foundation-stone upon which the “Church-estate” of Prussia has been built since his time; and his successors, the kings of Prussia, have taken the greatest care of this inheritance of their great ancestor. There are two oft-repeated sayings of Frederic the Great which at first sound rather frivolous: “In

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

my dominions every one may be saved according to his own fashion ;" and again, " Pay what you ought, and you may believe whatever you like." But every one will understand that the foundation of these sentences is precisely the principle which his great-grandfather would by no means give up—that the temporal sovereign was not entitled to prescribe the creed of his subjects, and if the latter but did their duty towards the Government in temporal affairs, their religious convictions should be let alone. It is at least true that the Reformed Church has aided in establishing this new empire which the princes of the Hohenzollern erected on the ruins of the old, after the Thirty Years' War; and the share of our Church in bringing about this result is greater than many acknowledge. From the Peace of Münster and Osnabrück (1648), when the monarchy of Charles the Great was dissolved, to that glorious day when William the Victorious proclaimed himself Emperor of Germany in the Royal Hall of Versailles, more than two centuries passed away, centuries of unwearied endeavour by the Hohenzollern family to establish their kingdom; from a very small beginning they advanced step by step, until that moment when they were able to gather the whole German nation under their standard. Droysen, the historian of Prussian politics, says (ii., 2, p. 612) of John Sigismund: " His new Confession was not only important as regards the affairs of the Church: it was altogether a grander and richer view of the world and of life which he adopted with it. By it he declared his resolution to go forward,—the same resolution by which the Netherlands had gained their liberty and had placed themselves in the van of progress in Europe,—the same resolution by which the Orange family had gained a glory which entirely eclipsed that of the proud Hapsburgians—the glory of the most courageous, most disinterested, and indefatigable struggle for the highest spiritual and moral principles—the glory of standing a free man at the head of a free nation." No one can deny that Droysen is right. But what formed this sturdy character in the Hohenzollern princes was the creed of the Reformed Church; the same creed which the Dutch adopted, which the Scots maintained faithfully and sincerely, in spite of all the persecutions they had to endure; which enabled the French refugees to resist the cruelties of their king, and which has created a new world on the other side of the ocean.

Again, Frederic II. had said, " I am nothing but the first servant of my people." Let politicians settle whether he was right and prudent in saying so or not: he only intended by these words to acknowledge the obligation incumbent on him as the king to take care of his people, and to spend all his time and energies in their service. His father also, Frederic William I., only regarded himself as always " serving." And when we learn that the great Elector's maxim was "*Pro deo et populo*," do we not hear the Reformed Church declaring through him that there cannot be a saving faith which does not make us faithful to our duty?



[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

While the Lutheran princes merely lived a life of earthly pleasure and outward splendour, utterly heedless of the welfare of their people, the princes of the house of Hohenzollern worked incessantly, and were, if not the first servants, at least the first labourers in their kingdom. They had learned through the Reformed Church to obey God and to do their duty, and understood the meaning of the word "discipline." This principle of our Church they endeavoured to introduce into the life of their state and of their people. That oft-repeated sentence which the old miller of Sansouci addressed to Frederic the Great, "There is a judge at Berlin," characterises the Government of the Hohenzollern. Indeed, there was justice in Prussia, independent of the will of the king; while, in the other States of Germany, all justice depended on the arbitrary will of the prince.

That Christmas Day of 1613 has been indeed a very blessed one, and John Sigismund's honesty and conscientiousness have succeeded in a way of which he himself could scarcely have had any presentiment. Let us hope that the new imperial family of Germany will never forsake those principles by which the Electors of Brandenburg have become great, nor that Church by which they were inspired with those principles.

FRIEDRICH H. BRANDES.

## LAND TENURE IN BIBLE TIMES.

### I.—PATRIARCHAL.

ONE of the most important and urgent social questions of the day is, undoubtedly, the question of LAND, and the laws regulating its possession, tenure, transmission, and succession. What is the real nature of property in land? In what sense, or to what extent, is it capable of being the subject of individual ownership at all? What are the proper limitations of personal right in regard to it? How far is the State, or body-politic, entitled to regulate its possession and tenure? To what extent is it, or ought it to be, capable of alienation and transmission? On what principles should succession to it be determined? Problems such as these are persistently pressing themselves into the forefront of "practical politics," and insisting upon being, in some way or other, solved and settled.

Now, amid the abundant literature which this question has produced, and the numerous addresses and speeches which have been delivered upon it, it is not a little singular (shall we not rather say ominous?) that there is hardly a single reference to the instruction upon it which may be derived from the sacred Scriptures. Statesmen, political econo-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

mists, social reformers, lawyers, and even clergymen have spoken or written upon it. Books have been written in exposition of the "Principles of Property in Land," and in illustration of the various "Systems of Land Tenure in different Countries," and yet, with the exception of two suggestive articles some years ago by an esteemed Free Church professor, there is scarcely a suggestion that light may possibly be obtained from the historic and legislative records of the Bible!

And this is all the more remarkable when we reflect that, apart from those general religious and ethical principles which the Scriptures inculcate regarding the relative duties obligatory upon men, and the responsibilities and obligations consequent upon the possession of property, they are, historically, the oldest and most authentic records in the world of the institutions of society and of property in their primal forms. In dealing with this subject, or with subjects of a similar nature, probably the most satisfactory course is to follow the historical method, to ascertain the earliest and simplest forms in which the institution presents itself, to follow their successive developments, and so to learn through what stages the various notions have passed that now make up the complex idea of "property in land." In pursuing this historical method, then, it is surely most inexcusable to ignore that volume which is pre-eminently the most venerable and the most reliable record of human history, which has happily been styled "the one body of primitive records in the world which is worth studying."

And this neglect to refer to the Scriptures is all the more remarkable, when we reflect that, in addition to the general principles which they inculcate, and in addition to the primitive historical records which they contain,—the Scriptures embody a complete and elaborate system of legislation, divinely prescribed, for the special purpose of regulating the settlement of an elect people in a chosen land, the allotment of the land among the original families of that race, the conditions of its possession by them, and the principles of its transmission to their descendants. It would surely be "passing strange" if such a system of legislation could contribute no aid toward the solution of the modern problems regarding land.

We purpose, therefore, to endeavour to collect and interpret the portions of Sacred Writ bearing upon the question of land tenure, with the view principally of ascertaining their bearing upon the modern problems. In addition to this economic aspect of the subject, however, the question occurs, What light do these notices on the subject of land tenure, contained in the earlier Scriptures, reflect upon recent questions regarding the age and authorship of the laws contained in the Pentateuch? To this subject, also, we propose to refer.

In seeking to realise this two-fold purpose, we shall—(1.) Examine the somewhat fragmentary references to the subject during the Patriarchal or old Canaanitish period; (2.) Inquire into the nature of the Egyptian land tenure as settled by Joseph; (3.) Inquire into the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

principles of the Mosaic or Israelitish system of land tenure ; and (4.) Point out the apologetic value of these Scripture records, and some of the general principles applicable to the subject of land tenure to which they appear to lead.

Before proceeding to the first branch of our inquiry, it may not be inappropriate briefly to inquire "What is land?" "What is comprehended within the term 'land' in discussions such as this?" Now, economically, land is the essential condition of all human being and well-being, individual, social, and political. We are neither fowls of the air, nor fish of the sea. We exist on the land, and by means of it. From it, either directly from its produce, or indirectly through the chemistry of animal life, we derive the means of subsistence and the fabrics for our apparel. From it we extract the materials with which, upon its surface, we rear the habitations in which we dwell. The bulk of our occupations are simply efforts, more or less successful, to subdue, and subordinate to practical uses, the elements which it yields. Into its kindred elements we are all, ultimately, resolved. We are all, as regards our individual, bodily nature, literally "of the earth, earthy." We appropriately speak of the ground as our "mother earth."

And what is true of the individual is equally true of the nation. We are divided into nations by geographical limitations. The land is the territory upon which the nation exists : and the physical conformation and characteristics of the land materially influence the character of the people. According as it is mainly pastoral or arable, rich or poor in mineral resources, level or mountainous, sterile or luxuriant, it determines the occupations and habits, and moulds the intellectual and moral characteristics of its population. Our country is appropriately termed our "Father Land."

From all this it follows that land, in a sense peculiar to itself, exists for the people. Like the Sabbath, it was "made for man, not man for it." It is the territory of the State, the floor of the national home. To permit of *absolute* individual ownership in land would, therefore, involve the anomaly of leaving the people of a country at the will of the minority. The many inhabitants would merely be tenants-at-will of the few landowners. Depopulation by landowners logically carried out would lead to national expatriation. Land, therefore, can never be the subject of property in the same sense or to the same extent as other forms of wealth. Property in land, whether individual or otherwise, must necessarily be subordinated to the wellbeing of the community. It cannot be allowed to assume or continue in forms which retard, or cramp, or prevent the natural development of the resources of the country, and the natural growth and realisation of the national life and civilisation. The radical interest in the soil inheres in the people who inhabit it ; and their welfare, their highest good, the fullest realisation of their national life, must ultimately determine and control whatever rights have been permitted to cluster around it.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

We shall afterwards see how far this fundamental principle of land tenure, which appears so simple and obvious, and which mankind are yet so slow to learn, appears throughout the Scripture records regarding it.

It may further be premised that, in our inquiry, we can derive little aid from the traces of a purely nomadic state of society, such as appears chiefly to have prevailed during the earliest period of sacred history. The patriarchs appear upon the far off canvas of history as nomad chiefs, exceeding rich in flocks and herds, moving, with their families and retainers and pastoral possessions, from place to place over the vast and fertile plains of the East, as the state of the pasturage or the necessities of their flocks dictate. It is obvious that in such a state of society there can truly be no such thing as "property in land" at all. The soil is valuable and valued only for the herbage with which it is clothed; and when that becomes scant, the people literally fold up their tents and betake themselves, with their possessions, to "fresh fields and pastures new." The portable tent of the patriarch is a fitting symbol of his slight and superficial attachment to the soil. The records of such a period are interesting in this respect only as revealing a state of society in which the idea of property in land is still below the horizon. It is only when we pass out of such a state of society as this—when men cease to be migratory and dwell in local habitations—when they engage in the settled pursuit of agriculture or associate themselves in village communities or cities, that land becomes really a "possession," and that "rights of property" begin to attach to it.

Coming now from these general observations, to examine consecutively the portions of Scripture bearing on the subject, we find *the first reference in the Scriptures*, and, indeed the earliest allusion in the world, to the tenure or occupation of land, in the first and second chapters of Genesis, where it is recorded that the Creator "gave to man dominion over all the earth, and over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth;" and that "God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there He put the man whom He had formed. . . . And the Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden, to dress it and to keep it."

We are afterwards told how, by his disobedience to the Divine command, or, in other words, by his violation of the condition upon which he possessed the garden, Adam forfeited its possession and was driven forth (Gen. iii.).

This reference is significant, as tracing the foundation and source of all right in the soil to the Divine Creator; and, in this view it has been regarded by Blackstone, by Lord Stair, and other writers on law. It is also significant as laying the foundation, at the very commencement of human history, of the principle which afterwards underlies and pervades the whole Mosaic legislation and polity, that the land is the Lord's, and

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

that it was to be held by the Israelites immediately under Him, as their Paramount Lord and Sovereign King.

### I.—EARLY CANAANITISH TENURE.\*

Passing over a period of twenty-one centuries, we find the first incident in the Scriptures illustrative of the actual institution of property in land, in the purchase of the field and cave of Machpelah, by Abraham, for the interment of Sarah, as recorded in the twenty-third chapter of Genesis.

This transaction is narrated with a minuteness of detail for which we must seek a reason elsewhere than in its mere subject-matter. The precision with which the transaction is recorded has not escaped the attention of the late distinguished professor of Scotch conveyancing, Alex. Montgomery Bell (see his work, 3rd ed. 1-24). While the fifty chapters of Genesis embrace the history of the whole early world for more than twenty-three centuries, an entire chapter is devoted to the detailed narration of this simple purchase of a field and a cave! Before proceeding, therefore, to examine the narrative more closely, we may notice, in passing, the following considerations regarding it:—

1. That it is the earliest recorded instance in the world of the sale and purchase of land. It, therefore, indicates a distinct stage in the progress of society and civilisation. It marks a definite point from which research into the history of property in land may start. The details given in regard to the transaction, the negotiating parties, and the formalities of the contract, reflect considerable light upon the whole state of society, and the condition of property at that remote period.
2. In connection with the Divine promise to Abraham of the land of Canaan for his posterity, it is worthy of notice that this earliest transaction in land is the purchase by Abraham, and the legal conveyance to him, of a possession in that very land. It is, doubtless, principally on this account that the transaction is so fully and minutely recorded.
3. It may only be further noticed, what an impressive commentary it is upon human life and possessions, what irony it throws around the very idea of property in land, what a rebuke it administers to everything like "earth-hunger," that this, the earliest recorded purchase of land, should be for a grave; not for a dwelling, but for a burial-place!

Passing from these general remarks, and approaching the detailed

\* On this subject, the following works are referred to:—"Primitive Property," translated from the French of Emile de Laveleye; "Early Hebrew Life," by John Fenton; "Land Tenure in Ancient Palestine," in *Church Quarterly*, 1880; and the writings of Sir Henry Sumner Maine. Without adopting, in all cases, the conclusions of these authors, the writer has freely availed himself of their works.



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

narrative, we find that it embodies a circumstantial record of the whole transaction, stating minutely from whom, by what means, and upon what terms, Abraham acquired the field and cave of Machpelah, and in what way the legal conveyance to him of the subjects was effected.

"The Hittites, or sons of Heth," says Dr. Cunningham Geikie, "appear as settled dwellers in Palestine, from Hebron in the south, to Bethel in the middle of the land, fond of peace, living in settled communities, acting through popular assemblies, and marked by a gentle civilisation." It is among this people that Abraham seeks to acquire "the possession of a burying-place."

In endeavouring to accomplish his purpose, Abraham does not directly approach Ephron, the owner of the field, as we should call him, but applies to the community of which he is a member: "He spake unto the sons of Heth." He prefaces his application with the statement, "I am a stranger and a sojourner with you." Michaelis states the distinguishing characteristic of a stranger, according to the earlier Scriptures, to be the non-possession of any landed property. The significance of Abraham's confession, therefore, is that he was not one of themselves—not a member of the Hittite community, who would legally have been entitled to obtain a share in their *ager publicus*, or public land; and he therefore seeks to become possessed of a share in such property upon such terms as a "stranger and sojourner" among them may.

"Give me a possession of a burying-place with you;" not the mere privilege of sepulture, but an actual possession of a burying-place.

The people at once courteously and cordially offer him, not the *possession* which he desiderates, but the *use* of any burial-place belonging to them: "In the choice of our sepulchres bury thy dead: none of us shall withhold from thee his sepulchre, but that thou mayest bury thy dead."

Abraham is not, however, satisfied with such a merely personal and temporary concession. He desires to secure a right higher and more permanent than that of the mere liberty of interment in one of their burial-places. And so, with all deference to the assembly which he is addressing, he continues: "If it be your mind that I should bury my dead out of my sight, hear me, and entreat for me to Ephron, the son of Zohar, that he may give me the cave of Machpelah, which is in the end of his field; for full money he shall give it to me, for a possession of a burying-place among you."

It is not without significance that Abraham designates Ephron by his patronymic, "the son of Zohar" (he is *patricius*, a native-born son of the community, and, as such, a land-holder); and that Abraham offers to pay, for the possession he desiderates, "full money"—not improbably meaning thereby the larger or "fuller" price which a "stranger and sojourner" would pay in comparison with one of the community.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

The narrative proceeds: "And Ephron *sat* (the authorised version erroneously renders it "dwelt") in the midst of the children of Heth. And Ephron the Hittite answered Abraham, in the audience of the children of Heth, even of all that went in at the gate of the city, saying, 'Nay, my Lord, hear me, the field give I thee, and the cave that is therein I give it thee; in the presence of the sons of my people give I it thee; bury thy dead.'" It is to be noticed that Ephron was sitting as a member of the communal assembly, but that he did not interpose until Abraham's proposal had been formally entertained by the assembly, and until the consent, tacit or otherwise, of the assembly, had been given to his intervention. It is also to be noticed that the narrative studiously insists on his "sitting in the midst," and "answering in the audience" of the people, and of the whole negotiations being conducted in the sight and hearing of "all them that went in at the gate of the city" in order to show the entire publicity of the whole transaction, and the concurrence throughout every stage of the proceedings of the Hittite community.

Many commentators regard Ephron's offer to Abraham of a gift of the field as an insincere one, a momentary effusion of hollow courtesy, preliminary to the exaction of an exorbitant price. But it appears to be more consistent with the whole spirit and tenor of the narrative, and with the relations apparently subsisting between the parties, to regard the offer as *bona fide*, and as made possibly in the hope that the "mighty prince" Abraham would, by its acceptance, ally himself with the Hittite community.

Sincere or insincere, however, Abraham courteously declines the proffered gift. Conscious of his Divine appointment as the founder of a new and favoured race, he will not ally himself with the "Sons of Heth." "Fully conscious (as Dean Stanley says) of the separation which was to exist between his seed and the tribes of Canaan, he will accept no favour at their hands, and refuses the gift of the sepulchre from Ephron." And yet he desires an indisputably legal title to a portion of the Hittite soil. He therefore salutes the assembly again, and, having obtained their sanction, addresses himself directly to Ephron "in the audience of the people of the land." "But, and if thou wilt give it, hear me; I will give thee money ("silver,"—Scotch, "siller") for the field; take it of me, and I will bury my dead there." Whereupon Ephron replied, "The land is worth four hundred shekels of silver; what is that betwixt me and thee? Bury therefore thy dead."

We have no information as to the extent of the field, nor its condition, nor the general value of land at the time, nor the relative value or purchasing power of the shekel; and, consequently, we cannot judge whether the stipulated price was a reasonable one or not. At any rate Abraham was satisfied. He had learned the terms upon which he, "a stranger and a sojourner," could acquire the land. And so the money was duly "weighed out," and the bargain formally concluded in the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

presence and audience of the whole community. The detailed narrative of the transaction closes with the somewhat striking statement that "the field, and the cave which was therein, and all the trees that were in the field, that were in all the borders round about"—a description as precise as that in any modern conveyance—"were made sure unto Abraham for a possession of a burying-place," not by Ephron, as we should have supposed, but "*by the sons of Heth*," the conveyance and the title to the land being thus granted and guaranteed by the whole Hittite community.

The fact of the field having been acquired by Abraham from the whole Hittite community is sacredly preserved in all the traditional references to it afterwards. Accordingly, in Genesis xxv. 9, 10, we are told that Abraham died, and "his sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him in the cave of Machpelah, in the field of Ephron the son of Zohar the Hittite, which is before Mamre—the *field which Abraham purchased of the sons of Heth*." And again (Genesis xlix. 29-32), about an hundred and seventy years after its acquisition, Jacob, when dying in the land of Goshen, "charged his sons, Bury me with my fathers in the cave that is in the field of Machpelah, which is before Mamre, in the land of Canaan, which Abraham bought with the field of Ephron the Hittite for a possession of a burying-place. *The purchase of the field and of the cave that is therein, was from the children of Heth*." The aged patriarch, dying in his Egyptian home, deems it necessary, with his latest breath, to reiterate and hand down with verbal precision, as it had been transmitted to him, the fact of the purchase of the field having been from "the children of Heth."

A review of the whole scope and tenor of this remarkable narrative leads to the conclusion that, at that early period, among the Canaanitish communities, land was possessed upon a somewhat communal system of tenure. The full force and homogeneity of the communal system is, probably by this time, beginning to exhibit indications of giving way. The sense of individual possessory right, arising doubtless from the advancement of settled agricultural pursuits, is apparently beginning to manifest itself. But still the essential elements of the communal system retain their sway. The idea of absolute individual ownership, of an arbitrary and irresponsible right of disposal and alienation, had not yet appeared. There is no such complete and unlimited proprietorship in land, on the part of individuals, as enables them to dispose of it as they choose. On the contrary, there appears to be, inherent in the corporate community, an acknowledged interest and right sufficient to entitle them at least to a controlling voice in regard to its alienation. The primary and radical proprietorship in the land appears to remain with the communal body, so that it cannot be alienated or disposed of without their formal sanction. But on the other hand, there appears at this stage, in individual members of the community, probably for purposes of cultivation mainly, a subordinate possessory right to particular

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

portions ; and this right is, subject to the sanction of the community, deliberately given in general assembly capable of sale and alienation.

The next transaction relating to the subject is the purchase, about an hundred and thirty years afterwards, by Jacob from "the sons of Hamor" of what the authorised version calls "a parcel of a field" near the city of Shechem, as recorded in the thirty-third chapter of Genesis.

The record of this transaction, unlike that of the earlier purchase, is of the most incidental and fragmentary character, being, in fact, nothing more than the naked statement of the purchase. But the light which it contributes is somewhat supplemented by the narrative, in the immediately succeeding chapter, of the subsequent negotiations for an incorporative treaty between the Shechemites and the household of Jacob. The latter narrative serves to present the framework of social circumstances and surroundings amid which the transaction took place.

"Jacob," we are told, "came safely to Shechem, which is in the land of Canaan, when he came from Padanaram, and pitched his tent before the city ; and he bought a parcel of a field, where he had spread his tent, at the hand of the children of Hamor, the father of Shechem, for an hundred pieces of silver."

Jacob's acquisition of the ground was shortly afterwards followed by overtures on the part of the Shechemite chiefs for a treaty of incorporation between their people and the household of the new landowner. Hamor and Shechem appear before Jacob and his sons with the proposal, "Make ye marriages with us, give your daughters unto us, and take our daughters unto you, and ye shall dwell with us, and the land shall be before you ; dwell and trade ye therein, and get you possessions therein."

Having obtained from the Hebrew household an ostensible accession to their proposal, Hamor and Shechem thereupon seek to secure its acceptance by their own community. They "came unto the gate of their city and communed with the men of their city, saying, 'These men are peaceable with us, therefore let them dwell in the land and trade therein ; for the land, behold it is large enough for them ; let us take their daughters to us for wives, and let us give them our daughters ; shall not their cattle, and their substance, and every beast of theirs be ours ?'"

In these fragmentary records we have indications of substantially the same characteristics and conditions of social life as appear in the more detailed narrative of Abraham's purchase ; while the tenure of land appears also to be practically in the same stage of development.

Jacob having come with his possessions and family and retinue of dependents, from the downs of Gilead to the city of Shechem, spread the tents of his household in a field near the city, doubtless pasturing his flocks in the open plains around. Desirous, however, of acquiring

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

a status and title higher than that of a mere squatter, he proceeds to purchase for "an hundred pieces of silver" an *allotment* of a field; and he is said to purchase it, not from any individual Shechemite owner, but from the corporate community, "at the hands of the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem." So brief is the notice of the transaction, that we are not informed whether, as in the case of the earlier purchase, any individual possessory right intervened at all. At any rate, Jacob's right and title to the land which he purchased flowed from the communal body.

It is worthy of notice that, in the record of this transaction, a somewhat technical and significant term, in connection with land, comes for the first time into use—viz., "Helkath-has-Sadeh,"\* translated "parcel," but more accurately "allotment," of a field. (In Scotch conveyances, it is called "plot or area" or "portion" of ground; whence the old Scotch designation of a small landowner as a "portioner.") The term uniformly employed in the Scriptures before this is simply "sadeh" or field, applied indiscriminately to undivided tracts of land, to the whole land of a people as well as to more limited areas—to cultivated land, to pasture land, and to land available for hunting. But the notion, and possibly the system, of apportioning the communal land, for purposes of cultivation, among the several families or individuals constituting the community, is beginning to prevail, and so it gives rise to the term "Helkath-has-Sadeh," parcel or allotment of a field.

We further see that, in the negotiations for an incorporative treaty, the Hebrew household treat as a whole—as a social unit—with the chiefs of the Shechemite community, and that the resultant advantages are represented to be, on both sides, communal,—to the Hebrew household, the acquisition of equal rights in the ample lands of the Shechemites, and, to the Shechemites, the addition of the abundant pastoral possessions of the proposed new citizens.

The significance of these fragmentary records is not in any way affected by the particular circumstances which suggested the proposed treaty, nor by the *mala fides* of the one contracting party, nor by its speedy and treacherous violation. The narrative presents essentially the same features of social life—the same stage of civilisation as the earlier record. We have the same indications of communal life, the same absence of any thing like individual ownership in land, the same entire subordination of land and land tenure to the circumstances, the conditions and wants of the corporate body.

These two narratives, then, which are the only records shedding light upon the actual position of land, in the earlier period of sacred history, appear to indicate that, among the Canaanitish peoples at least, land was originally held, not upon a system of individual ownership, but by the communal body itself, in subordination to its own collective circumstances, conditions, and wants; that, by the growth of agriculture,

\* Stanley's "Sinai and Palestine," Appendices 15 and 20.



[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

and primarily for convenience of cultivation, allotments of the common land came to be held by individual members or families, and possessory rights consequently sprung up and came to be recognised; that, with the consent of the community, deliberately and solemnly given in general assembly, the possessory right to these allotments might be transferred to an acceptable purchaser; and that, in such cases, the purchaser's right and title flowed directly from the corporate body.

We shall close this section of our inquiry by pointing out briefly the apologetic value of this view of these early transactions. We are very far from sympathising with the mental or spiritual attitude which assumes that the Scriptures are, from time to time, to be tremblingly weighed in the uncertain balances of modern investigation and thought. The sublime elevation and soul-saving efficacy of Scripture truth are, after all, what really "commend it to every man's conscience in the sight of God;" and these can never be affected by any advances, real or supposed, in human knowledge. Still it can never be otherwise than interesting to the believer in inspiration to notice how far the matured results of independent research and reflection, on the part of studious men, harmonise with the Sacred Records.

Now, the views of primitive land tenure indicated by this construction of these Scripture records are in complete harmony with the most recent results of investigation and thought on the general subject.

Professor Hunter, in his work on Roman law, points out that the application in recent years of the strictly historical and inductive method of research to legal studies, has entirely overthrown the speculative theories of the earlier writers on jurisprudence regarding the origin of property. The earlier jurists, both in this country and on the Continent, when treating of rights of property, uniformly maintained the theory that rights of property arose "when men began to respect the right of the first occupier of what was previously appropriated by no one." The exploded theory of a "State of Nature," followed by a "Social Compact," belonged to the same order of speculative thought. Rousseau maintained that the real founder of civil society was the man who first enclosed a piece of land, and said "This is mine." Individual right, founded upon personal appropriation and occupancy recognised by others, was thus, according to this view, the earliest to be acknowledged. This theory, however, is now universally seen to be untenable; and, on the contrary, "conclusive evidence has been brought forward, from a great variety of sources, to show that when ownership in land is first recognised, it is *not* ownership by individuals, but ownership by groups," by communities or families. Individual ownership arises only upon the disintegration of such groups, and the distribution of the communal property among individuals.

This view has been established and illustrated, with immense learning and ability, by such writers as Emile de Laveleye, Professor Nasse, and, in our own country, by Sir Henry Sumner Maine, in his works on

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

"Ancient Law," "The Early History of Institutions," and "Village Communities in the East and West." The historical researches of these eminent writers coincide in establishing that the separate or individual ownership of land is of comparatively modern growth, and that, originally, the soil belonged in common to communities.

Sir John Lubbock, in his recent work on the "Origin of Civilisation, and Primitive Condition of Man," says: "We find evidences, in so many countries, of the existence of village communities, holding land in common, that there seems strong reason to believe that, in the history of human progress, the individual property in land was always preceded by a period in which moveable property alone was individual, while the land was in common."

And Dr. Lewis H. Morgan, of America, in his work on "Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress," states, as his conclusion, that, in the earlier stage of civilisation, land was held, not by an individual, but by a communal tenure. "Lands," he says, "were owned by the tribe; but, as cultivation advanced, a possessory right to cultivated land came to be recognised in the individual."

It will thus be seen that the independent conclusions regarding the primitive forms of land tenure, arrived at by men who—with no apologetic purpose in view, and with no reference to Scripture at all—have devoted their special attention to the subject, harmonise with and support the view indicated by the fragmentary and incidental records of Sacred Writ.

RICHARD REID.

## PHILIP HENRY AND HIS RECENTLY PUBLISHED DIARIES.

WHAT enduring vitality belongs to a noble character! Philip Henry, of all men the least covetous of fame, seems destined to an immortality that might make a devotee of modern altruism pause and consider. Often quoted as Matthew Henry's father, he becomes dearer for his own sake the better he gets known. There is a charm about him of a kind which does not belong to his distinguished, though more prosaic son. His pious worth has distinctive features that give it peculiar interest and fascination for many devout hearts.

Philip Henry is the *family saint* of English Presbyterianism. The home life at Broad Oak is his special glory. When Leighton was taken to task by his sister for some religious exuberance, and she said, "Ah! if you had a wife and children, you would not act thus," he replied, "I know not how it would be, but I know how it should be, for *Enoch walked with God* and begat sons and daughters." What was ideal to Leighton was the attainment of Philip Henry. With nothing mystical

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

or monkish about his retirement, he threw a halo of sanctity round all the domestic relations, and made his dwelling a proverb for everything true and pure, honourable, lovely, and of good report. What streams of gracious influence have come forth from that well-ordered and hallowed abode.

The unambitious temper of Philip Henry is seen in the motto he chose from Thomas à Kempis, "*Bene vixit qui bene latuit.*" But though fond of the "quiet retreat" of his study, and the "silent shade" of a country pastorate, he could not continue hid. Leaving behind him much carefully prepared and beautifully written material, that has been in large measure turned to good account, the life by his son Matthew made him widely and favourably known. Out of this grew, nearly sixty years ago, the triple set of family memoirs, so congenially executed by Sir John Bickerton Williams, F.S.A., a collateral descendant. These greatly deepened the earlier impressions, and since then, the interest has been stirred afresh by the issue of sermons or other remains, such as the exposition of the first eleven chapters of Genesis. Now we are favoured, after two centuries, with some diaries \* "for the first time printed, almost as they stand in the original" that may yet further embalm Philip Henry's name and show us that—

"The sweet remembrance of the just,  
Grows green and blossoms in the dust."

Of thirty-nine diaries, written with a crowquill, for the most part in pocket almanacks from 1657 to 1696, Mr. Lee has been able to obtain twenty-two, and in piecing these together he shows exemplary care and research. But while greatly admiring Philip Henry's character and piety, he shows no regard for his position and principles as a Presbyterian minister and a sufferer for conscience' sake. This is a serious disqualification in an editor, and it has betrayed Mr. Lee, with his High Church notions, into a most unfair and objectionable practice. He thinks fit to enter into acrimonious conflict with some of Philip Henry's most cherished convictions, trying his best to discount them by an apparatus of controversial footnotes, which he may deem needful as correctives, but which others may reckon ill-judged and unhappy.† So

\* Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry, M.A., of Broad Oak, Flintshire, 1631-1696. Edited by Matthew Henry Lee, M.A., Vicar of Hanmer. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

† A sufficient antidote to Mr. Lee's method of narrating events may be found in a book of rare candour just issued from his own publishers, "A History of the Church of England from 1660," by Canon Molesworth, of Rochdale. Mr. Lee, for instance, begins his account of the Savoy Conference in this style—"The Presbyterians demanded;" and he ends by saying, "but they would not come to terms." Hear how Mr. Molesworth opens and closes the same story. "The chair was then taken by Sheldon. . . . He lost no time in displaying that uncompromising spirit by which he was all along evidently actuated. . . . Instead of meeting the Presbyterian divines . . . on that footing of fair equality which the warrant and all the preparations made for the Conference entitled them to expect, he at once threw them into the attitude of *petitioners* to the bishops for the amendments they desired to obtain." And he thus concludes: "But this does not

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

far as the notes elucidate genealogies, personal references, and other matters of fact, they are really of service. Otherwise they are a mistake, and sometimes in the worst possible taste. If he had but observed the words of his own preface—"The present phase of public taste is rather to hear what men of note say for themselves, than what others say of them"—he would have done more justice, both to himself and Philip Henry. It would not be edifying to dwell on the blunders of these notes. Enough to indicate a few points to which Philip Henry attached importance. There is, for example, the validity of his presbyterial ordination, which the re-established Episcopal Church refused to own. He charges it with inconsistency, because, when the Scotch Presbyterian ministers were consecrated bishops at Lambeth in 1610, they were not re-ordained, and when French or Dutch Presbyterian ministers came into England to preach, *they* were not re-ordained, only licensed like the Church's own clergy. How does Mr. Lee answer this? He refers to Leighton and those who, in 1661, submitted with him to re-ordination. But this does not alter the other undeniable facts: and for him to say, "To the claim of Presbyters to ordain, the answer is, We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God," is to reveal both petulance and ignorance. Is he not aware of the existence formerly in his own Church of "Peculiars," who were but presbyters with ordaining powers? What of the 35th Canon of 1603-4, which prescribes that "they who shall *assist* the bishop in examining and *laying on of hands* shall be of his cathedral church, if they may conveniently be had, or other sufficient preachers of the same diocese, to the number of three at the least?" Even Bancroft himself, though the first to broach in the Church of England the Popish notion of the Divine right of prelacy, when Andrewes, bishop of Ely, would have had the Scotch presbyters of 1610 re-ordained, insisted "that thereof there was no necessity, seeing where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by presbyters must be esteemed lawful, otherwise it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches." Mr. Lee is sadly mistaken if he supposes he has represented "the various pleas" by which "Christians who had no bishops" would "try to justify their position." Let him first ask himself how it happens that the apostolic practice of "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" finds no place whatever now in the Church of England. An old friend of Philip Henry "told y<sup>e</sup> Bp. (of Chester) y<sup>t</sup> though his ordination by presbyters were not *legal* yet it was *evangelical*."

When Philip Henry deploras the prevailing lack of discipline in the Church, Mr. Lee says, somewhat peevishly: "He might also have

excuse the conduct of Sheldon, and of those who acted under his leadership. It was unquestionably their duty to have met the Presbyterians in a moderate and conciliatory spirit, and with an honest desire to sacrifice things that were not essential, or at least to show that no agreement was attainable. Instead of acting thus, they laboured to defeat the charitable design they had been convened to promote."

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

remembered how the Founder of the feast did not send Judas away." Surely he knows how modern scholars *agree* that Judas *was* dismissed *before* the institution, whatever some of the Fathers may have thought, or however the English Communion service may *suggest* the traitor's continued presence. As regards posture in public worship and kneeling at altar rails, to which Philip Henry would not conform, how noble his sentiment, "To the command of my *superiors*, I oppose the command of my *supreme*, saying 'Be not ye servants of men, and call no man master,' which I do when I give a blind obedience to their injunctions *for the authority's sake of the injoiners*, rendering me no reason why or wherefore but only *sic volo sic jubeo*; and to do this in the things of God's worship I conceive to be sinful." The rails were one of Laud's freaks, "an innovation warranted by no law, neither Divine nor human, civil nor canonical." That the Lord's Supper was observed by guests round a *table* was the all-sufficient standard for the Bible-taught Philip Henry. Not without pain and pity we find Mr. Lee writing as he does respecting "the altar," a word that never once occurs in the communion office of his own Church; always "Table," fifteen times over. On compulsory kneeling, which was so obnoxious to Philip Henry, we need only quote the unbiassed "finding" of Dean Stanley (Christian Institutes) after his elaborate historical survey: "It was the point on which the Church most passionately insisted and which the Puritans most passionately resisted. The Church party in this were resisting the usage of ancient Catholic Christendom and disobeying the canon of the first Ecumenical Council, to which they professed the most complete adhesion. The Puritans, who rejected the authority of either, were in the most entire conformity with both."

There was a vein of large Christian catholicity in Philip Henry. This should have warned off all temptation to deal with him in the fashion of ecclesiastical narrowness or bigotry. Mr. Lee allows "there was nothing about him of a Separatist spirit." In some respects he seems a puzzle to his editor: there was in him so much tender regard for the conscientious scruples and usages of others, and withal such an inexpugnable claim to have his own respected in turn. On one occasion there came into his service "members of y<sup>e</sup> congregated church at Wrexham who disowned singing of psalms in mixt assemblies. I was much put to it, whether to offend *them* by giving forth a psalm, or *others* that were present and *my own* light and convictions by omitting it; but the Lord came in with power, and I hope I chose the right way. We sang Psalm xc. 12, &c., and I observe some of them joynd with us. Lord, let mee know in everything what *Thou* wouldst have mee doe, esp. in Thine own worship." His ardent desires were toward the communion of *saints*, the *holy* Catholic Church. With what relish and comfort he writes: "Notwithstanding the sad divisions in the Church, all the saints, so far as they are sanctified, are one: One in their aims, one in their askings, one in amity and friendship, one in interest, one in their



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

inheritance. . . . The things in which they are agreed are more and more considerable than the things in which they differ. They are all of one mind concerning sin, that it is the worst thing in the world ; concerning Christ, that He is all in all ; concerning the favour of God, that it is better than life ; concerning the world, that it is vanity ; concerning the Word of God, that it is very precious." To Philip Henry the Word of God was very precious, all his Presbyterian views and all his doctrinal or ecclesiastical positions being derived straight from its authority. A careful, habitual, and most devout student of Holy Writ, and a cultured Hebrew and classic scholar, he was perhaps a better or at least a more accurate *exegete* than his son. "Go, study the Scriptures. I profess to teach no other learning but Scripture learning," he would say to those intending the ministry who came about Broad Oak. This it was that made him a fine specimen of the truly Catholic Presbyterian, with wide sympathies for everything and every one he could at all recognise as Christian. Alas ! his editor does not shrink from saying, "The Calvinist would have little scruple in denying the possibility of salvation to a Romanist." Doubtless a man has no title to salvation *qua* Romanist ; but a Romanist *qua* Christian is another matter. Calvinism is to many a bugbear, a *bête noir* in proportion to the grotesqueness of their misconceptions respecting it. Yet what is Calvinism but the right method of setting God and man in their true relations, like the genuine astronomy which ascends above the appearance of things and seeks elsewhere than earth for the centre of our system ? In the moral universe God must be supreme and sovereign ; redemption, in all its parts and effects, the result of His free and spontaneous love,—the saved having no stronger claim on God's mercy than others under condemnation, and being ever ready to ascribe their salvation, without reserve in their adoring wonder and thankfulness, to the unsearchable riches of Divine grace. For, whatever people may be in their professed creed, they cannot avoid being Calvinists in their prayers and their praises, giving *all* the glory to God.

Attempts are made in these notes to minimise the number of the "ejected" in 1662, and explain away the significance of that memorable event. It may suffice to meet the quotations of the Vicar of Hammer by the narrative of another vicar who is an impartial witness and the most recent historical investigator. Mr. Molesworth says ; "But about *two thousand* ministers of religion relinquished the benefices and other offices they held rather than make the declarations required of them. They went forth from their parsonages, not knowing whither they were going or how they were to be supported. No allowance was made to these good men from the benefices they thus relinquished. . . . This day (St. Bartholomew's) was selected in order that the incoming Episcopalians might receive the revenues for the quarter then ending, while the outgoing Presbyterians, who had done the work, were

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

excluded from all share in the payment for it. This proceeding was as impolitic as it was harsh and cruel." And the whole context is equally suggestive and emphatic.

From such topics of debate we could fain have turned to listen to Philip Henry himself as he speaks to us in these Diaries and Letters. The records vary of course in value and interest, but they need to be lingered over to be appreciated aright. They are a beautiful and unstudied revelation of a very noble and saintly life. We need it much in these present days. We are grateful to Mr. Lee, though compelled to animadvert on his mode of procedure, in the hope he may follow wiser counsels in editing the "Diaries and Letters of Matthew Henry" that are promised as forthcoming.

A. H. DRYSDALE.

## THE DEACON IN HISTORY.

### I. THE APOSTOLIC AND EARLY AGE.

IT has been much disputed whether the seven men, of whose appointment we read in Acts vi., are to be identified with the deacons whose qualifications and duties are set forth in the later Pauline Epistles. There is no doubt that the conception of the deacon's functions which early began to prevail in the Church, according to which the diaconate was simply the lowest stage in the threefold order of the ministry, tended greatly to encourage the view that the office of administrator of church beneficence—an office the duties of which are so expressly defined—is not to be regarded as the equivalent to that of deacon in the Church. If the identity of these seven men officially with the deacons of the Pastoral Epistles were admitted, there would be a *prima facie* case against the recognition of such officers as a rank in the ministry, seeing that these seven were set apart to a special work, just in order that the apostles and evangelists should be free to engage purely upon the ministry of the Word. It was therefore very natural that those who had come to regard the diaconship as co-ordinate in some sense with the presbyterate and episcopate should hesitate to admit that these almoners of the Church at Jerusalem were the first deacons.

On the other hand, it is very clear that when we consider the functions which those men were required officially to perform, we do find in them the exact prototype of the deacon, as his office is conceived of in the Presbyterian Church. In a broad and general way these men had to do with the outward affairs of the Christian community, which in those days happened to be principally the diligent collection and faith-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

ful distribution of alms to the poor ; while our deacons have also to do with the outward affairs of the Christian community which, in the altered circumstances of society, require their diligence chiefly in the collection and distribution of congregational funds for ministerial support, missionary schemes, and maintenance of church fabrics. The prejudices, therefore, of Episcopalians and of Presbyterians would lead them, in treating of the origin of the office of deacon, to lay special emphasis respectively on the passages in the Pastoral Epistles, and on the narrative of the 6th chapter of Acts. But while this is so, we find advocates of the Episcopal theory, like Rothe, and advocates of the Presbyterian theory, like Ritschl, agreed in refusing to recognise the Seven as deacons in the sense of the later epistles.

It is not to be supposed that we have to do simply with a question of names when we inquire whether these seven men were deacons. It is not asked whether they were known on their appointment as deacons and formally so called. But it is distinctly asked whether the functions discharged by them for the Church are not such as we may consider to have been discharged by the deacons of the Pastoral Epistles, consistently with the enumeration of their duties and qualifications given there.

It has been common among the defenders of Presbyterian Church polity to maintain, or rather simply to assume, the identity of the seven men and deacons. That the assumption of identity is unwarranted might appear from the very fact that nowhere in the New Testament, nor yet among the Apostolic Fathers, is any such identity affirmed. The word deacon is not used in the Acts of the Apostles to distinguish any particular office. There is a diaconate of the Word (Acts vi. 4) as well as a deacon's service at tables (*διακονία τοῦ λόγου* and *διακονεῖν τραπέζης*). It is thus a general term for ministry, requiring some determining epithet to indicate any special church office. The seven men are not called deacons in a special sense, though in the general sense their functions are a diaconate. And further, we find that Stephen, by far the most conspicuous of these men, is never called a deacon, even by the earliest Fathers, who speak much of him. The first who ventures to call Stephen a deacon is Irenæus, in the last quarter of the second century ; and it is noticeable that in the sentence where this affirmation is made, Irenæus shows himself peculiarly careless in his statement of facts. He says—"Stephanus qui primus in diaconium ab apostolis electus est" (Stephen, who was the first elected by the apostles to the deaconship) (Adv. Hær. iv. c. 15, 1). Now the least attention to the narrative in the Acts would have shown that not the apostles but the members of the Church at the call of the apostles elected these seven men to their office. Irenæus here, on the one hand, states what is contradictory to the letter of Scripture ; and on the other hand, assumes what Scripture evidently does not affirm. At the same time, we can scarcely suppose that such a one as Irenæus would have ventured to make an assertion like this, with such confidence of manner, unless there

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

was in the Church of his time a consensus of opinion in favour of that view.

When we come down a half-century later in the history of the Church, we find this opinion of Irenæus reaffirmed by Cyprian. We find, however, this champion of the hierarchy defending his assumption on peculiar grounds. His view of the office of the seven men is that they were servants (*δῆκονοι*) of the apostles. Surely we have here an error as great as that of Irenæus. The deacons, indeed, of the Cyprianic age were wholly dependent on the bishops—simply administrators according to the bishop's will, without any personal responsibility. The seven men appointed at the instance of the apostles received their office just in order that they might relieve the ministers of the word of those administrative responsibilities, and in this special province they were endowed with full authority. In this respect the parallel instituted or suggested by Cyprian does not hold. In the Bampton Lecture for 1880, Mr. Hatch has sketched in a very brilliant manner the relations subsisting between deacon and bishop in the early Church.\* The offerings of the church members were made to the president in the Assembly, who was regarded originally as himself personally responsible for their distribution. The bishop was viewed as primarily the administrator; and this function in a community in which were so many poor members, in which too, during times of persecution, prisoners had to be looked after and their families attended to, and generally the duties of hospitality discharged, was one surely of peculiar importance. The deacons were assistants to those supreme officers, making actual distribution of the alms and prosecuting all necessary inquiries. By and by, the deacons came to be regarded as a class corresponding to that of the Levites, and so subordinated to the presbyters, who were supposed to answer to the priests of the Mosaic dispensation. In modern times the relation of archdeacon to the bishop represents what in the early Church was the relation of deacons generally to the bishop. This view of the functions of the diaconal office does not correspond, as we have already hinted, with representations given of the office to which the Seven were appointed. The duties of the Seven—the serving of tables—can only, even on the widest understanding of the word “tables” to signify tables for money and tables for food, indicate acts of administration in regard to the actual necessities of the members of the Church. But, according to the conception of the deacon's office entertained in the age immediately following that of the apostles, it was the duty (so Justin Martyr) of the Seven to pass the eucharist to the members, and to carry it to the homes of those who had been absent. Such duties might perhaps quite naturally be assigned in certain circumstances to the same men but certainly could not form part of the original official functions of the Seven. So far no case has been made out for identification.

If, however, we pass back from the sixth chapter of Acts to the fifth

\* “The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches,” Lecture II. pp. 26-54.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

chapter, we shall find reference made to certain young men who were present in the Christian assembly, evidently recognised as helps and prepared to discharge any helpful service required of them. In the parent Church of Jerusalem, in those the early years of her existence, ecclesiastical arrangements were characterised by extreme simplicity. Formally everything falls under the consideration of the apostles. There is no other recognised office. We might, however, quite naturally conjecture that many details of government and administration would be committed informally to those members of the Church who most commended themselves to the apostles for their general prudence, or for their special capacity for any particular work. And, indeed, the mention of those young men already referred to removes this from the province of mere conjecture. Here we have a little company of young men whose energy, strength, and heartiness, mark them out as helpers of the apostles and of the church. As young men, they would be characterised by zeal and enthusiasm, and this would be indispensable in such a community and in such times. Some (as, for example, Mosheim) have regarded the service of these young men to be the same as that to which afterwards the Seven were appointed, and have supposed that as they were Jews, the dissatisfied Hellenists were only quieted by the appointment of certain of their own number to have a care over their special interests. Rothe (*"Die Anfänge der Chr. Kirche,"* § 23) keenly opposes this view, as also the identification in any way of the Seven with the deacons. Julius Müller (*"Dogmat. Abhandl.,"* s. 554) rightly maintains with Mosheim the similarity of function in the young men and the Seven; guarding, however, against the supposition that the Seven were Hellenists, intended to counterbalance the Jewish leanings of the young men. At the same time, we may agree with Meyer, who, in his commentary on the passage, maintains that the dissatisfaction was not with the apostles, but with those who had already been administering in their place. The opinion which we think in all the circumstances most probable is, that before the recognition of any special and regular office of administration—while still the apostles were formally charged with these as with all other Church functions—they were in the habit of relegating these outward matters to unordained and officially unrecognised individuals; and the election of the Seven was simply a constitutional ratification of their previous practice. The Seven, though all bearing Grecian names, need not be regarded as all Greeks, any more than we should so judge Andrew and Philip among the apostles to have been Greeks because of their names. And out of the young men who had approved themselves for diligence, prudence, and impartiality, we may fairly suppose that the selection would be made. According to this view, we do not claim to have in Scripture any definite order for the appointment of a new church office; but we have the story of the origin of an important congregational institution which circumstances rendered necessary, the evident usefulness of which would occasion its general



[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

introduction. The authority of such office-bearers in Jerusalem lay in this, that, by apostolic advice, men were chosen to an office which the apostles themselves constituted by the relegation of a certain department of their own functions. The same necessities occurring in other churches, apostolic action at Jerusalem would at once afford a precedent for the appointment of similar office-bearers. The office was clearly, like the Scottish deaconship, a congregational and not a church office. The determining of the number seven for election, seems to show that their official acts would be limited to the one church community for which they would suffice. The passage referring to deacons in Timothy speaks of their qualifications, and says nothing about the origin of the office or about its duties. It would, therefore, be unfair to expect in such a passage statements which would determine for or against the identification of the office there referred to, with the appointment spoken of in the Acts. All, then, that we can fairly do in the way of comparing the passage in Acts vi. with the passage in 1st Timothy is to set side by side the enumeration of qualifications which are specially mentioned as affording guidance in the election—men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom (Acts vi. 3)—with the enumeration of qualifications in the Epistle (1 Tim. iii. 8, 9)—grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre, holding the mystery of the faith in a good conscience. When a candid examination and comparison of these two passages are made, it will appear that in both cases prominence is given to qualities fitted to awaken among church members confidence in the capacity and in the moral integrity of men who were to be charged with the control of the Church's treasury and allied trusts. As officers in Christian churches, a credible and consistent profession of the Christian faith was indeed an indispensable condition. Whatever the office might be, the fact of its being a church office implied the insistence of this test as a pre-supposition. The ideal deacon, filled with the Holy Ghost, is nothing more than the ideal church member. "Holding the mystery of the faith in a good conscience" means nothing less and nothing more. The special gifts by which the New Testament deacon is distinguished are those which, in the eyes of his brethren, mark him out as a brother fitted to control and dispense aright the general affairs of the community.

Some of the least satisfactory sentences in Ritschl's noble work on the constitution of the old Catholic Church, are those in which he argues against identifying the seven men with the deacons because of the difference of their designation.\* No one disputes that *διάκονος* and *διακονία* are used both in the New Testament, and in the ecclesiastical literature of the early centuries, in the general sense of service. But it is surely quite a reasonable supposition that the office, in designating which the word *διακονία* continued for the longest time to be used, in combination with some other qualifying phrase, should ultimately come

\* Ritschl, "*Die Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche*," § 355.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

to be distinguished by the word *διακονία*, without any qualifying term, and then no longer in a general but in a special sense. The *διακονία τοῦ λόγου* (the ministry of the Word) was soon familiarly indicated by quite different terms, so that we may suppose the original phrase fell early into desuetude: and when *διακονία* was ordinarily used only in the phrase *διακονία τῶν τραπέζων*, the qualifying term would come to be regarded as redundant and so dropped. The word is used very frequently by Paul to designate his own apostolic office (Rom. xi. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 3, 6; iv. 1; vi. 3, 4; xi. 8, 23; Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 23, 25.) It is interesting to notice how, in all these passages, the connection requires that we should understand the word as immediately indicating that lowliness of mind which, after the example of Christ, the Apostle endeavoured to maintain toward those among whom he laboured. In every case where Paul calls himself *διάκονος* or his office *διακονία*, he is consciously bringing to the front his willingness to be the servant of all. Significant too is the change from the use of the word *διάκονος* in 1 Cor. iii. 5, to that of the word *ὑπηρετής* in chapter iv. 1. The deacon clearly is always the servant, and when Paul assumes the name he is consciously taking the lowest place. If, in relation to the less gifted church officials or those younger in years and service, the Apostle and his companions exercised authority in all departments, yet as acting in the Church for God, Paul was ever mindful of his personal feebleness and insignificance. This is brought out very prominently in 2 Cor. iii. 3, where the Spirit of God is represented as the writer, and Paul compared to the slave that carries about and cares for the tablets. Throughout, we find the Apostle's use of the word such that we might expect an early appropriation of the term for the office which was concerned with the outward affairs of the Church. "Deacons," says Hooker, "were stewards of the Church unto whom at the first was committed the distribution of Church goods, the care of providing therewith for the poor, and the charge to see that all things of expense might be religiously and faithfully dealt in" ("Eccles. Polity" Bk. v. ch. 78). They were also, he adds, to attend on presbyters during Divine service. He then fully admits that all further duties laid on deacons are not enjoined by Scripture, but afterwards required by the Church in the exercise of her liberty. It seems that no other position is required by us in order to support the Presbyterian view against the Hierarchical. It was for attention to the poor and the equitable distribution of Church goods that deacons were originally appointed. Hooker maintains that the "torch of time having clean worn out those first occasions for which the deaconship was then most necessary," it was right to add other duties and continue the office. Would it not be fairer to say, the original requirements ceasing, and with this the need of a separate office, that office *de facto* comes to an end? The proper conclusion, on Hooker's own lines, would surely be the reduction of the degrees of ecclesiastical orders, and the recognition of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

only apostles and presbyters. We maintain, on the contrary, that duties cognate with those of the original Seven, instead of becoming less and insignificant, have become more numerous and more complicated. Hence, we as Presbyterians do not require, like the great apologist for the ecclesiastical order of Episcopacy, to regard the diaconship as an office founded on Church authority with a name borrowed from another office of the Apostolic Church, but we simply go back to the conception of that office which on Hooker's showing belongs to the time of the apostles. Our deacon's duties are the same in kind with the apostolic deacon's; whereas, in the Church from the third century to the Reformation the duties laid upon the deacon could not have been described as *διακονία τῶν τραπέζων*, but only as *διακονία τοῦ λόγου* restricted in a manner altogether unauthorised.

JOHN MACPHERSON.

---

## Symposium.

---

### PROGRESS IN THEOLOGY.

#### No. IV.

THE subject selected for the present discussion cannot be regarded as inopportune. "Progress" is the watchword of the age. The very air we breathe is resonant with the triumphs of the human mind in almost every department of investigation. It is not unnatural that men in sympathy with this spirit of free inquiry and scientific progress should raise the question, "Whether the science of Theology is to be regarded as an exception to the operation of this law of progress, and to ask whether this marvellous march of mind is to be arrested when the boundaries of this particular science have been reached?" Or, to put the question as Principal Tulloch puts it, "How can there be a science differently constructed from other sciences? What is science," he asks, "but our mental grasp of any order of facts? The facts may be 'natural' or may be 'revealed,' to use customary language under a certain measure of protest (because such words as 'natural' and 'revealed,' apart from explanation, cover many ambiguities); but the knowledge of them in any definite form can only be reached in one way—by inquiry and reflection. Whatever may be the character of the facts themselves, or wherever they may be found—in what is called the 'book of nature,' or in the 'book of revelation'—we can only *know* them, they can only become science, in virtue of our study and co-ordination of them. The divine facts of revelation, no less than other facts, must be arranged and systematised before they can assume the form of science. We

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

must carefully note, compare, and classify them, and then reproduce them in coherent relation or system, before they become a theology. The very name 'Systematic Theology' is a testimony to this."

Now, irrespective altogether of the merits of the question at hearing, this can hardly be regarded as an accurate statement of the case as between the science of Theology (*i.e.*, Systematic Theology) and the other sciences. 1. In the first place, the "book of nature" comes far short of the "book of revelation" in point of clearness. In the book of Revelation we are brought face to face, not with the dumb phenomena of nature, whose significance may tax the mightiest intellects, but with living intelligences, who address us in human speech, or through personal acts whose import they are careful to explain. A theologian studying the Epistle to the Romans, or the Epistle to the Hebrews, in order to deduce therefrom the elements of his science, is in a very different position from that occupied by Kepler, as through weary years of watching he traced and tested the planetary motions along his hypothetical curves. In the one case, the facts are stated or enacted; in the other, they have to be discovered by toilsome experiments. The great discovery of Kepler, that the planets move in elliptical orbits with the sun in one of the foci, is simply a fact of nature; but surely no one will say that it was as easy to find it there as it is to find out from the book of Revelation that salvation is not by works, but by faith. The discovery of Newton, that every particle of matter in the universe attracts every other particle with a force varying directly as its mass, and inversely as the square of its distance, is simply a fact of nature; but who will say that it is as clearly revealed there as the doctrine of substitution is revealed in the Old Testament and the New?

2. In the second place, while it is true, as Principal Tulloch states, that "the facts of revelation, no less than other facts, must be arranged and systematised before they can assume any form of science," it is equally true that the leading, determining facts of Revelation have been "arranged and systematised" for us by the Author of the Revelation Himself. These determining facts, divinely given, have been divinely arranged and systematised. The Scriptures not only inform us of the fact that there is an *economy* of redemption, but they give us an outline of this economy, and give it so fully that we are left without excuse if we do not apprehend it. Let a few instances suffice. In Romans iii. 20-31, we have the following elements of this economy specified and stated in their correlation:—(1.) That justification by the works of the law is impossible. (2.) That the righteousness which the law demands as the condition of our justification, has been provided by God Himself, and revealed by the law and the prophets. (3.) That this righteousness is available, through faith in Jesus Christ, for the Gentile as well as for the Jew. (4.) That it is a righteousness which God has provided through the propitiatory death of His Son. (5.) That He was moved to provide and bestow it simply by His own free will and

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

good pleasure. (6.) That this righteousness, thus provided, was necessary to justify God in justifying men, whether under the Old Testament or the New.

Take, as another instance, Romans viii. 28-39. Here we have the following truths scientifically linked together :—(1.) That God has made choice of a people. (2.) That He has predestinated them to be conformed to the image of His Son. (3.) That He has ordained the several steps by which this conformity is to be effected—viz., calling, justification, and glorification. (4.) That He presides over the whole process, sparing not His own Son, but delivering Him up for us all, and ministering everything necessary to the final accomplishment of the eternal purpose of His grace, and permitting no event, and no order of being, to thwart Him in carrying it to a triumphant issue.

Now, these are but specimens of the way in which the plan of redemption is indicated in the Holy Scriptures, and in view of these and like representations, it is certainly not presumptuous to claim that God has done for the theologian in the "book of revelation," what He has not done for the scientist in the "book of nature"; that He has not only furnished him with facts, out of which he may construct his science, but with these facts expounded, "arranged, and systematised." Nor is it too much to add, that no one is warranted in placing the books of nature and of Revelation on a par as sources of information on their respective subjects, both in regard to questions of arrangement and systematisation, or in asserting "that theological science is a product of human intelligence, in like manner as any other science."

In this connection it may not be out of place to notice a doctrine, propounded by Principal Tulloch, regarding the relation of knowledge to religion, faith, and free-will. "No human being," he says, "can be secured infallible knowledge of anything, and if he could, his knowledge would cease to be religious. If he could not help believing, the essence of belief would be destroyed in him. What he calls his belief would be quite apart from his will, and, therefore, quite apart from his conduct. It would be of the nature of demonstration or superstition—neither of which is religion."

On the position here taken, it may be remarked—1. That if it be valid, then the Revelation given us in the Bible is not infallible, for it has been communicated to us through "human beings," who, according to the writer, "could not be secured infallible knowledge of anything." 2. That if the infallibility of a man's knowledge destroys his faith, it must follow that saving faith cannot be belief of an infallible truth. 3. That if the infallibility of a man's knowledge destroys the religious character of it, religion can have no relation to truth, and must be placed under the category of superstition. On this theory it is difficult to see how one could meet an agnostic, or hold that there is any connection between truth and sanctification. Ignorance, however, is not the mother of devotion, nor is piety the offspring of agnosticism.



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

Religion is an estate in which the whole moral and spiritual powers of the soul are enlisted, embracing the Cognitive powers, the Feelings, and the Conative powers. Within this sphere it is pre-eminently true that apart from a Cognition there can be no Feeling, and that without Feeling there can be no Conation. 4. Hence it follows that so far is the apprehended infallibility of the knowledge of which faith takes hold from destroying the voluntariness of the agent in believing, that there can be no Conation at all, either in the form of a desire, or a volition, without such apprehension. A man is not free to believe anything which he does not apprehend as true; and *true* here means *infallibly true*. The great barrier to such freedom as is demanded in the passage in question, is the constitution of the human mind, by which the will is linked to the Cognitive powers through the medium of the Feelings. The degree of our credence will always be determined by our views in regard to the truth of the thing we are asked to believe. 5. It is worthy of note, that while the theory represents demonstration as a foe to faith, the Apostle Paul regards demonstration as essential to it; for he tells the Corinthians that his "preaching was in demonstration of the spirit and of power, that their faith should not stand in the wisdom of men but in the power of God." 6. It certainly follows, if the theory be true, that there can be no religion in Heaven. If the infallibility of knowledge destroys its religious character, the redeemed in glory cannot be religious; for, whatever may be said about their knowledge here, their knowledge there is free from even a shadow of doubt. They see as they are seen, and know as they are known; and having attained to an estate of infallible knowledge, they must, if this theory is to be credited, cease to be religious. 7. And, finally, it would seem to follow also, that the Son of God, whose knowledge is perfect, cannot act with the full consent of His will in admiring and loving the everlasting Father! There is, after all, even in the highest instance of free agency, a *felix necessitas boni*.

But to return to the subject, there can be no doubt that there is at present a widely prevalent opinion that our Theology is not keeping abreast of the age. Rationalism is, of course, an advocate of progress. Holding, as one class of Rationalists do, that the reason of man is both the source and measure of our knowledge of God and divine things, they take the ground that Theology, in regard to progress, is on a par with the other sciences. Those Rationalists who admit the fact of a Divine revelation, so modify this admission by subjecting its doctrines to reason as the ultimate standard by which all truth is to be tried, that they cannot be regarded as differing, practically, from those who object altogether to the fact of a supernatural revelation. Both classes contend for a progress in Theology over which human reason alone shall preside, determining authoritatively both the material and the architecture of the future temple of truth.

Owing to peculiar university arrangements, inspired by an Erastian

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

State policy, this view of the relation of the human mind to the science of Theology has obtained to a lamentable extent on the Continent of Europe. A young man after taking his academic degree may obtain leave to lecture, and, if he succeed as a lecturer, may be raised to the rank of a Professor in any department of Theology, though he make no profession of a personal experience of Christianity save what was implied in his baptism. The young Professor, thus raised to a university status, may proceed to speculate and frame theories on every subject throughout the wide empire of theological science, treating the most venerable truths as open questions. After a while his speculations obtain publicity through the press, and his theories, constructed independently of the analogy of the faith, and, it may be, of that spiritual discernment of which "the natural man" is destitute, are seized with avidity by some young men as veritable truths, and are regarded as discoveries which antiquate the most cherished beliefs of the people of God. This is the theological progress of Rationalism which has carried Germany into the vortex of infidelity, and which is at this moment, through universities, theological seminaries, reviews, and theological treatises, assailing the very foundations of Christianity itself in Great Britain and America.

Inspired by this spirit of progress, a man may throw overboard all that the Scriptures teach respecting the origin of the human race and the original state of man, and may speak of "primitive man," not as endowed with knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, but as so ignorant of the Author of his own being and of the universe as to regard "nature as a living thing, possessing a voluntary life," and containing in itself the cause of its own existence; or, as Strauss has put it (who, it would seem, was still in this primitive state), may represent our first father as concluding that the cause of the Kosmos is the Kosmos itself. In a word, the advocates of progress may speak of man as entering upon life as a savage—indeed, as passing through all the stages of the Darwinian descent—and yet be regarded by some advocates of theological progress as veritable high-priests of theological science.

One of the peculiar characteristics of such progressionists is the extravagance of their claims. It is not uncommon to find them claiming, as the result of their own investigations, the discovery of facts and features of the Biblical record which the so-called traditionalists have always held. For example, it is quite usual for this progressive school to boast that the idea of the development of a system of doctrine in the Bible is a discovery of modern Biblical criticism (meaning thereby "the newer criticism"), and that the idea that the Bible is a thing of historical growth has only just now been brought to light by this wondrously acute critical science, and that the unity of plan and purpose which runs through and gives character to this unique literature, was never heard of till these learned critics pointed it out.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

The writings in which these claims are put forth are (here and in America, at least), usually apologetic, and the writers wish to be regarded as defenders of the faith against the assaults of those scientists who regard Christianity as a foe to scientific progress, or as liberators of the sacred record from the bondage of an intolerant Tradition. The thing aimed at may be desirable, but the methods adopted by the most advanced progressionists are most objectionable. They undertake the readjustment of the defences, but the readjustment commonly turns out to be but an extension of the circumvallation so as to embrace the works of the enemy. It may serve to give greater definiteness to this discussion if, instead of dealing further with the general question of progress in Theology (a question already admirably handled in Dr. A. A. Hodge's contribution to this symposium), we examine, under the head of misconceptions of progress, a few contributions of the class commended in *The Catholic Presbyterian* for March, by the Rev. Dr. Newman Smyth.

One work of this class proposes, in accordance with the "scientific principle of continuity" (to wit, that there can be no physical effect without a physical antecedent), to defend the doctrine of the possibility of life after death; and, in doing so, it takes positions which are in direct antagonism with the Scripture doctrine of the creation of matter, and with the doctrine of miracles, and of the resurrection of the dead, and gives us a Trinity with the absolute, unconditioned, unknowable, of the transcendentalists, as a substitute for God the Father—an impersonal entity destitute of causality, whose existence, therefore, the authors, as scientists, have no right to assume—destroying at once the correlative relations of Fatherhood and sonship, and thus reducing the children of God to an estate of absolute orphanage!

Accepting very largely the principles of this apology, with some of its gravest eschatological conclusions, Dr. Smyth, speaking as an evolutionary apologist, proceeds in a recent work to review the old faiths in new light. Although he is half conscious that the new lights are themselves shifting, he nevertheless goes on with the adjustments in the glare of their delusive sheen. The result is, that the old faiths not only appear in new lights, but have their forms so foreshortened and distorted that identification is all but impossible. The old faiths in this work have undergone such readjustments as the palace ornaments of Tiglath-Pileser II. were subjected to by Esarhaddon, who turned them topsy-turvy, and chipped and chiselled them to fit environments altogether alien to the ideas of the original sculptors and architects.

Premature apologies are as unwise in theological matters as they are in social intercourse. If we are to readjust our faith to the ever-changing theories of scientific speculation, we shall find ourselves pledged to an annual, or semi-annual modification, and discover, in the end, that while we have not succeeded in reconciling the scientists, we have unsettled the faith of some of our weaker brethren. Such

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

readjustments require very peculiar qualifications. He who will undertake the task must take heed ; (1.) That the alleged *data* of the scientists are veritable facts, and not of the mythical order of the Huxleyan *Bathybius*. (2.) That the scientific deduction has been legitimately drawn. (3.) That the doctrinal views proposed for adjustment are in harmony with the revealed Word of God. (4.) That, eschewing the Esarhaddon expedient, he will estimate the scientific theory in the light of the inspired record. The first three of these conditions no one who has any claim to a hearing will challenge ; and the fourth ought to be regarded as a canon for the guidance of our inquiries in all departments of investigation on which the supernatural revelation sheds its superior light. It is, in fact, simply another way of saying that established truths are landmarks for the guidance of farther explorations. Our "dead reckonings" on the voyage of progress must be corrected by observations on the celestial lights.

Had the writer referred to observed these rules, he had never accepted the conclusion of the *final* dissipation and absolute ultimate effeteness of the visible universe, or attempted a readjustment of the Scripture doctrines of heaven and the resurrection of the dead on the assumption of the essential corruptibility of matter. He would have seen that, even on their own showing, the authors of "The Unseen Universe" have forfeited all right to predict such Kosmical catastrophe. Holding, as they do, that Kinetic energy and life in the Kosmos can be accounted for only on the assumption of an intelligent agent who is the author of the one, and of a living agent who is the author of the other, these eminent scientists should have modified their prediction accordingly, and should have concluded, as scientists (in harmony with the teaching of Scripture, which represents the former of these agents as upholding all things by the Word of His power, and speaks of Him as the one by whom all things consist), that while these authors of energy and life exist, there is no scientific warrant for the belief that the visible universe will become finally effete. The final issue of a universe quickened into energy and life by the fiat of such agents, must be determined by their will and sovereign good pleasure, and not by the qualities or laws of the material elements which enter into its constitution. As a knowledge of the qualities and laws of matter would not have enabled a scientist to predict the origin of energy and life (as is conceded in the admitted necessity of assuming the existence of intelligent living agencies), it must be evident that such knowledge cannot enable him to forecast a cessation of these mystic phenomena. If a man will be a materialist, let him be a materialist throughout ; but let him not theorise as a spiritualist till he has got the machine of the visible universe into motion, and stocked it with living organisms, and then speculate regarding its future destiny on purely materialistic principles, as if the spiritual agents whose help, as a scientist, he felt compelled to invoke, had abandoned the workmanship of their own

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

hands. It is one thing to teach, as the Scriptures do, that the visible universe shall be folded up and changed; it is another to teach that it shall become finally effete. The existence of these great agents proves that this latter, as a scientific conclusion, is unwarranted, and hence proves also that the adjustment of the old faiths in this instance is altogether gratuitous. Knowing "the Scriptures and the power of God," God's people will take sides with Christ against all deniers of the resurrection of the dead.

Some of the advocates of theological progress mean by progress a reconstruction of existing dogmatic systems. These, it is held, were very well in their day, and served important ends. They were the offspring of their times, and took their form and hue from "the spirit of the age" or nation which gave them birth; but those qualities which fitted them for the service of the hour are qualities which unfit them for service in these later and more enlightened times. The comparative theologian, enlightened by a study of Platonism, Buddhism, or Parsism, can humanise these stern dogmatic systems so as to give them currency in this more ethical and æsthetic age. However manifest the conflict among the different heathen religions may be (even though they but furnish illustrations of the truth of the apostolic verdict that the world by wisdom knew not God), the magic wand of generalisation can blend them into one, and prove that their fundamental conceptions have their complement and *pleroma* in the Gospel of Christ! It is as unhistorical, as it is unscriptural, to allege that these religions exhibit "natural elements of Revealed Theology," or premonitions of the Gospel of Christ. The so-called "natural elements" are simply residuary fragments of the lost knowledge of God, retained in systems which, instead of indicating different stages in a process of theological evolution, furnish unquestionable evidence of a process of moral and spiritual degradation.

The gospel which can adopt and supplement these elementary heathen premonitions, however, is widely diverse from our ancestral faith. "The new movement," as Dr. Smyth tells us, "is an endeavour to put all theology upon a Christological centre." It insists "that all the doctrines contained in the Protestant Confessions shall be lifted bodily up, off from their foundation in a system of decrees, and placed upon a thoroughly ethical and human—in one word, a Christological—revelation of God." What this Christological centre is we are not left to guess. "Christian theology," Dr. Smyth informs us, "finds its living centre in the Incarnate Word." By this we are to understand simply the Word as Incarnate, and not the Incarnate Word as crucified, as we shall soon see. The Incarnation, and not the Atonement, is the new centre from which the reformation of our whole Protestant theology is to proceed!

On this evolutionary transformation of our Theology it may be remarked—1. That it is unscriptural and unscientific in its theory of the Incarnation. The theory which seems most popular at present is



[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

that the *Kenosis* by which the *Logos* made Himself of no reputation involved the laying aside of everything which would prevent Him from becoming truly and properly a man—the Ideal Man. The terms by which this process is described indicate its thoroughness. It is a “depotentialiation,” “denudation,” “impoverishment”—an impoverishment which a late writer describes as “a species of death”; somewhat akin “to that which believers experience prior to the passage from earth to heaven.” This process is ante-natal, natal, and post-natal. It begins with changes of depotentialiation within the nature of the *Logos* prior to His becoming incarnate, which reach their lowest point at the moment of union with our flesh; but from that point forward the process is one of re-potentialiation, and consists of progressive influxes of the divinity throughout the maturing manhood of the Christ, which are completed when He sits down at the right hand of the Majesty on high as the perfectly incarnated God, or, as it ought to be expressed, as the perfectly Deified Man! This is not theological progress; it is simply retrogression to the anomalies of the later Lutheranism.

This view, it is claimed, is the scientific view of the incarnation. With all due respect, it is submitted that it is utterly unscientific. This is manifest, for it violates the scientific principle that attributes and essence are inseparable. If so, then this doctrine of the depotentialiation of the *Logos*, in order to His becoming man, is, scientifically viewed, an impossibility. If this scientific principle be valid, the *Logos*, so long as He retained that Divine essence which is essential to His existence, could lay aside no attribute of His nature, and, therefore, must have retained every attribute, and every personal characteristic, which belonged to Him as a person of the adorable Trinity without abatement, throughout all the stages of His wondrous humiliation. Such is the only view of that amazing stoop which science can stamp with its approval. Thus far and no further can science enter the precincts of this august subject. It can forecast nothing, it can explain nothing connected with this deepest of all mysteries; but there is one thing it can do—it can place an authoritative negative upon any theory which rests on the two false correlative assumptions—(1) That God can humanise Himself by a process of depotentialiation; and (2) that man can be elevated by a process of potentialiation so as to become capable of comprehending within himself the essence and attributes of the infinite God! This is all one with teaching that God can cease to be God, and that the finite can be expanded into the Infinite. Progress on these lines can be made only at the sacrifice of all Theology, whether natural or revealed. He who can believe in such an incarnation as this need have no difficulty in accepting the cosmogonies of Hinduism or the transubstantiation of Romanism.

2. It may be remarked that our theological reconstructionists are not only wrong in regard to the nature of the incarnation, but also

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

in regard to the place they assign it in the economy of redemption. Dr. Smyth says, it is "not God's sovereign will, not God's eternal decree, but God Himself, God in Christ, [that] is the central truth and glory of Christian life and thought. From this return to the Christological centre of Christian theology, we are to gain also enlarged views of the fact of the incarnation; of its central significance in the idea of moral creation; of its possible cosmical relations." As Dr. Martensen has put it in his "Christian Dogmatics," pp. 327-29: "The advent of Christ, the revelation of the highest good, cannot be viewed as a means towards something else, but must be looked upon as its own end; all things, all nature, and all history must be looked upon as means for Christ." Any one who wishes to see this theory of the incarnation, as the centre of Christian Theology, carried out to its utmost kosmical radiations and consequences, has only to read these pages of Dr. Martensen's work.

The objections to this view of the position and relations of the incarnation in the economy of redemption are obvious—1. It sets aside the sovereign will and eternal decree of God, to which we are indebted for the incarnation itself. Apart from that decree, there had been no incarnation, and the incarnation is but one step in the vast chain of means, every one of which has been ordained of God for the execution of His eternal purpose of grace. In doing this it sets aside God the Father, and ignores His relation as the fountain-head of the whole economy. 2. Instead of being its own end, the incarnation is declared in Scripture to have been a means towards the expiation of sin. Throughout the epistle to the Hebrews our Saviour's assumption of the nature of the sons of God, who are constituted His brethren, and whom He was appointed by the Father, in "the divine decree," to lead to glory, is represented as subordinate to the expiation of their sins. It was because of this that a body was prepared Him, and it was for this reason it behoved Him to have somewhat to offer. 3. This is certainly the view of "the Christological centre" presented in the preaching of the apostles. Paul does not single out the incarnation as the ground of his glorying. On the contrary, he emphasises the cross and the crucifixion, and avows his determination to know nothing among those to whom he ministered save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. This preaching he proclaims as the power of God and the wisdom of God. 4. The cross, and not the incarnation, is "the central truth and glory" in conversion. The ablest advocates of the subjective theory—as, for example, Bushnell, in his "Vicarious Sacrifice"—have to confess "a want here, and [that] this want is met by giving a thought form to the facts which is not in the facts themselves. They are put directly into the moulds of the altar, and we are called to accept the crucified God-man as our sacrifice, an offering or oblation for us, our propitiation; so to be sprinkled from our evil conscience, washed, purged, purified, cleansed from sin." 5. The cross is "the central truth and

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

glory" in sanctification. Here, holiness is the end, and the sufferings and death of Christ the means. "Far be it from me," says Paul, "to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, *through* whom the world has been crucified unto me and I unto the world." This is the rule by which he walked, and upon as many as walked by it he invokes peace and mercy. 6. The cross is "the central truth and glory" in heaven. The great burden of "the new song" is the redemption achieved through the blood of the Lamb; and when the angels join their voices to swell the volume of the mighty anthem, they found their ascription of "power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honour, and glory, and blessing," upon the fact that He was slain. 7. The cross is "the central truth and glory" in the functions of Christ's mediatorial office. This is very beautifully symbolised in the book of the Revelation, chap. v. 6, where the seven horns representing Christ's omnipotent power as King, and the seven eyes symbolical of the plenitude of the spirit possessed by Him as the prophet of the Church, are ascribed to Him as the Lamb that was slain. It is as the Lamb that He occupies the throne, bears the sceptre, and administers the sealed book; and it is as the Lamb He leads and feeds His blood-bought, blood-washed Church. "The Lamb is all the glory in Immanuel's land," as He is all the glory in the life and death of the believer. In reference to this question of "the central truth and glory of Christian theology," one may employ the language of Dr. A. A. Hodge in regard to the chief characteristics of the economy of grace and the doom of the impenitent. "The presumption," he says, "is a million to one that the entire historic Church, as a body, to whom the unction was promised, has not uniformly erred in one direction in misreading these words [of Scripture], written expressly for their instruction." This language is peculiarly pertinent here; for the readers, in this instance, embrace the living creatures, which are full of eyes round about and within, and the glorified elders, and the unfallen angelic host. If the odds are a million to one against an error of the Church militant in relation to the subjects specified by Dr Hodge, what arithmetic shall estimate the odds against a "misreading" on the part of the Church triumphant and her companions in glory, under the immediate instruction of the omniscient Lamb Himself, where the single point in question is, His own position, as such, in the economy of redemption? There is no room for the balancing of probabilities here. All heaven is on the one side, and the advocates of the new Christological centre on the other.

With regard to the bearing of this theory upon Christ's redemptive work, it is obvious that, if true, it must affect that work fatally; for, as His work depended for its efficacy and merit upon His personal rank, it must follow that all the obedience He rendered in the estate of personal depotentiation (an estate from which He did not fully emerge prior to His enthronement at the right hand of God), must have been

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

rendered by one who was not divine, and who, consequently, must have failed to meet the demands of justice upon the many brethren whose nature He assumed. This conclusion would be modified somewhat by the theory of those who regard the incarnation of Christ as an individual as completed at His baptism, and His incarnation as the head of an organism as entering on its final stage at the Last Supper ; but the principle at stake is the same notwithstanding any possible modification. The theory, in this latter form, involves the conclusion that the efficacious atoning work of Christ was limited to the final stages of His earthly history. Works of this class speak much of Christ's perfect human life as exhibited through all the stages of infancy, boyhood, and manhood, as the great reconciling element of the Gospel. This representation, however, is but partial truth. Our Lord's whole life of obedience, as well as His sufferings and death, is, it is true, embraced in the work of reconciliation ; but He who will obey and die for sinners, *as their substitute*, must in His obedience, as well as in His death, possess the divine nature, if His work is to be efficacious and transferable, in its meritoriousness, to those on whose behalf He acts.

These writers, however, are not embarrassed by objections of this kind, as their theories do not embrace the principle of imputation. According to the representations of some of them, the Atonement is simply the natural outcome of the principle of self-sacrifice, common to all holy virtue, and found in infinite perfection in the divine nature—in fact, an attribute of God Himself. Our Saviour acted out this principle of self-sacrifice. He submitted voluntarily to the law which governs the conflict with evil, and by submitting to it triumphed over it. If we are to triumph over it we must imitate His example. Our salvation begins when we do for ourselves, individually, what Christ did as our Exemplar—viz., adopt and act upon this principle of self-sacrifice. In other words, Christ saves us by showing us how we may save ourselves.

Others, again, bring Christ much nearer to the sinner. According to one, He takes, not the burden of our guilt as a thing imputed, but the awful freight of our impurities. Substituting the mystical for the federal union, this writer represents Him as receiving into Himself the impurities of men as the ocean receives the impurities of the rivers, and teaches that it is in this way He purges their sins. The sacrificial types of the Old Testament, the author of "The Old Faiths in New Light" alleges, "were never intended to teach anything beyond the truth at the heart of sacrifice, that all we have is His, and with entire faith in His goodness should be devoted to Him." The trial of Abraham's faith was intended to teach him "that God does not wish the offering of blood," a doctrine which, we are informed, the later prophets knew—viz., "that God loves mercy rather than sacrifice." This is all one with saying that even the later prophets were not aware of the central truth of our redemption—viz., "that without the shedding of blood there is no remission !" This is "the newer criticism" over again. Down

at least to the times of the later prophets, the covenant of works was still in force, or, if abolished, men won life on Socinian principles, and had no knowledge of the expiation of sin as a condition of acceptance with God. Such a resetting of "the old faiths" involves a reconstruction of the economy of redemption, the elimination of the atonement from the Mosaic economy, and the impeachment, not only of the sacred writers, but of God Himself, who, by His sanction of their literary frauds, made Himself a party to the deception practised upon Israel!

Respecting all these contributions to theological progress, suffice it to say:—1. That their sympathies are with Lutheranism in its modern pantheistic modifications. 2. That they are not demanded by any established conclusion of the science of our age. 3. That in all points where they can be scientifically tested, they are demonstrably unscientific and unphilosophical. 4. That, while their advocates profess to speculate as evolutionists, they lay aside a fundamental principle of evolution when they treat of the Atonement. It is a fundamental of evolution that the essential and characteristic elements of the fully-developed organism must have existed in the primordial germ; and yet writers of this class, in developing their theological system, find no place for the essential and characteristic element of an Atonement, as a thing ordained of God, prior to the Babylonish Exile! 5. That they are as unscriptural as they are unscientific. Instead of contributing to the advancement of Theology, they bear witness to the anti-Reformed theological retrogression and deterioration of our times. This may appear strong language, but it is not stronger than the facts demand. Theories which would, if accepted, revolutionise the faith of the people of God, not simply in regard to the constitution and destiny of the universe, but in regard to the fundamental doctrines of Christ's person and work, and the resurrection of the dead, are not to be hailed as contributions to theological science, but, on the contrary, are to be noted as doctrinal departures from that theological system which was given back to the Church of Christ by the theological giants of the sixteenth century. In taking up almost any one of these current speculations after a reading in the works of Calvin or his contemporaries, one is sensible of a *bathos* almost as deep as when he passes from the writings of the Apostles to those of the fathers. The progress from the Reformers to many of the most noted modern progressionists is a progress from noon to night, from the definiteness of truth to the vague uncertainties of crude, delusive speculations.

With regard to the changes in our old-fashioned Theology, which, it is alleged, are demanded by the vast progress in Biblical Criticism, it is as satisfactory as it is assuring to know, what the ablest Biblical critics proclaim as the result of their investigations—viz., that no discovery made by them affects any doctrine within the entire circle of revealed truth. There is not a single essential doctrine of the faith which the humblest reader of our English Bible, under the teaching of the Holy



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

Spirit, may not discover with infallible certainty. So far as these great, determining, fundamental verities of our holy religion are concerned, the ablest critic has no advantage over his humbler brethren. The reason of this is obvious—1. The truths of the gospel are, without a single exception, revealed in plain texts of Scripture, which the simplest may understand. 2. No doctrine of the analogy of the faith is dependent for proof upon any obscure passage, but, on the contrary, is taught again and again in texts about whose import there is no room for dispute. 3. The only theological advantage which the critic has over an English reader is that he may be able, as for example in 2 Cor. v. 14, to show that a particular passage may be adduced in support of a doctrine which the latter, because of his ignorance of the original, could not have found in it, although he had found it abundantly testified to elsewhere.

But while these misconceptions of theological progress are rejected, it is not held that the Church of God has not made progress in her past history in her study of the divine Word, or that by her research she has exhausted the *βάθος* of revelation. In presence of the wisdom and knowledge of God, revealed in the history of His dealings with our race, even an Apostle must cry—"Oh! the depths." The riches of Christ, in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, are unsearchable, and His love passeth knowledge. The infiniteness of the themes, however, with which Theology deals, does not demand for the study of them a reconstruction of the economy of redemption. A science is not to be treated as if it were a mere hypothesis. Progress in astronomy does not involve the reconstruction of the Newtonian system. It was not by such treatment of the principles of that system that Adams and Leverrier determined the position and mass of the planet Neptune before the telescope was turned upon that lonely sentinel of the solar array. What astronomy is to the progress of our knowledge of God's works in the starry firmament, such is our grand old Calvinistic Theology to the study of His works as they shine forth in the firmament of revelation. There is not a single doctrine of the analogy of the faith that does not shine out with greater splendour when, in accordance with that system, it is set in its own doctrinal constellation, and traced to its fountain-head in the sovereign grace of our Covenant God. It is the only system of Theology that can be called scientific, as it is the only system which humbles man and exalts God. As its essential elements are divinely set in their systematic relations in the sacred Scriptures, it must ever be regarded as the touchstone of all theological speculations, and the guide of all genuine theological progress. Both science and criticism must submit their results to the arbitrament of the analogy of the Faith.

ROBERT WATTS.

[The next paper in this series will be by Professor Bruce, D.D., Glasgow.]

## Portfolio Leaves.

### PROFESSOR GODET ON FEMALE PREACHING.

THE following Biblical study, "On the Participation of Women in the Ministry of the Word," so *apropos* at the present time, is from the pen of the learned and distinguished professor of the Free Church Faculty of Neuchâtel, and is translated from the *Journal Religieux* of French Switzerland :—

"Before entering upon the subject which is about to occupy us, I wish to declare my deep sympathy with the zeal and sincere piety of the women who, for some time past, have felt called upon to address themselves publicly to the portion of our population upon which the ministry of the pastors has often very little influence, and I do not doubt that in many cases the Divine blessing has accompanied their well-intentioned efforts.

"It is none the less true that, in order to be blessed in a durable manner and not to degenerate grievously in the end, all Christian activity ought to be ruled by the directions of the Lord and His apostles. The latter were delegated by Him to trace out for the Church a path conformable to His will. He said to them : 'He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me.' Very bold, therefore, must he be who would willingly contravene the positive commands which He has left us !

"Upon the subject of which we are treating we have three declarations of Paul, who, as the founder of numerous churches, is the one among the apostles who has most fully treated questions of this sort. The most explicit of these declarations is in 1st Corinthians, chap. xiv. : 'Let your women keep silence in the churches : for it is not permitted unto them to speak ; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home ; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. What ! came the Word of God out from you, or came it unto you only ? If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.'

"To this very precise declaration which the apostle says he has received from the Lord Himself, some have attempted to reply that in this passage he is only speaking of assemblages *belonging to an ecclesiastical organisation*. But at that period, the distinction between organised and free meetings did not exist, and what the apostle opposes to *the churches* is merely *the house*. If a woman wishes to ask anything, says he, let her do it not in church, but at home. He knew very well that by a *ruse* natural to the weaker sex, certain women, seeing themselves deprived of the liberty of *speaking* in public, would try to recover that liberty indirectly by giving themselves the air of asking for explanations, of *asking* questions ; and he sends them back to *the house* and to *their own husbands*, even in regard to these questions.

"Others—and we should not wonder if this expedient issued out of a feminine brain—pretend that the apostle, in forbidding women to speak, meant that they should not whisper, chatter among themselves during Divine service. But would the Apostle have required to appeal to a commandment of *the Lord* in order to prohibit this slight impropriety ? Besides, all through this chapter there is no question of general rules of propriety to be observed during worship, but only of the different *forms of discourses* in use in the churches, such as prophecy and the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

gift of tongues, and of the ruler who ought to preside at them. Therefore when the Apostle prohibits women from *speaking*, this prohibition can only be that of preaching under one or the other of these forms. This results still more evidently from the manner in which the Apostle appeals to the custom observed in all the other churches. Who can seriously believe that he would have thought of saying to the Corinthian women, 'We have no such custom in the churches'—neither in that of Jerusalem, from which the Word went out, nor in the others to which the Word has come—as that of women whispering together during the meeting? And in making such a prohibition, which is the most natural thing possible, would he have added what follows? 'If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him *show his inspiration* by acknowledging that it is by the command of the Lord *that I forbid this disorder*.' No, evidently! There is therefore something grave in question here, and this something was the liberty which the Corinthian women were beginning to arrogate to themselves, of speaking in religious meetings. Doubtless they took advantage of a maxim often repeated by the Apostle himself, 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.' But the very passage we are examining shows how the Apostle understood these words. He merely meant to speak of equality before God and in *direct relation* to Christ; but this equality is quite different from *gifts* and *functions*. All communicate directly with the Lord,—the woman as well as the man; this is the way in which they are one in Christ. But not the less does each realise his or her dependence on the Lord in a manner conformable to the natural position which Providence has assigned them. The woman does not become a man, and the man does not become a woman in Christ any more than the slave ceases to be a slave in becoming by faith *the Lord's freeman*, and the freeman does not cease to be free in becoming by faith *the Lord's bondman*. Compare this carefully with 1 Cor. vii. 21, 22. Each one, therefore, after becoming a believer, ought to remain in the natural position in which the call of Christ found him; such is the general principle laid down by the Apostle in this same chapter, and repeated three times following (ver. 17, 20, 24). The woman thus remains a woman, even in the Church, conformably to the subordinate position which nature and the law agree in assigning to her.\* It is this humble position which she repudiates in setting herself up to speak in public, and Paul recalls her to herself and to the modest and reserved bearing wherein consists her dignity, in here applying the severe term of a *shame*,—that is to say, something contrary to natural modesty. If it be objected, 'But still, the Christian woman going to the pulpit or platform may do good, and may reach hearts which the voice of no pastor would have touched. The salvation of souls is before all else! The letter of the apostolical prohibition ought to yield before the irresistible power of the Spirit.' To all these utilitarian considerations the Apostle simply replies by affirming the *Divine* origin of the precept which he has just been giving, 'The commandments of the Lord,' and by adding, 'But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant!' This brusque conclusion is a threat. It is as if he said, 'Let him disobey if he dare! He shall have to bear the consequences.' It would be easy to quote, in the history of the Church, numerous facts which justify this prophetic threat.

"In short, it is not simply an indecency which the Apostle discerns in the position which the Corinthian women were taking, it is something more serious—a danger serious for the welfare of the Church. He explains himself upon this subject in a second passage not less positive than the preceding—1 Tim. ii. 10-14: "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was

\* 1 Cor. xi. 3—"The head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God." Ver. 14, "Doth not *even nature itself* teach you," &c. Chap. xiv. 34, "They are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith *the law*."

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.' It is not without a reason that, in the second proposition in these verses, the Apostle substitutes for the name of *Eve* the general term *the woman*. He means by this to indicate that the facility of letting herself be seduced is not the characteristic merely of the first woman but of the whole female sex. To the woman belong the admirable qualities of sensibility, imagination, self-abnegation,—in a word, all that comes from the heart; but she is wanting in the power of pondering, in the faculty of laying hold of a subject in its entirety, of considering it in itself, independently of all personal circumstances. In a word, woman is ardent, passionate; and this is why the Lord Jesus, along with His interpreter Paul, expressly refuses her all participation in the ministry of the Word. It was through the woman that Satan managed to bring about the fall of mankind; and it would be through her that he would most easily lead the Church astray if she had the right to direct it. The fine gifts of the woman are to be exercised in another sphere. This is what the apostle indicates in adding, in verse 15, notwithstanding her having been the cause of the Fall, she shall be saved in living a family life, "if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety." The last-mentioned means properly *empire over herself*; and, after what precedes, it is not difficult to understand what the apostle means by that. It is the holy limit which a woman, were she even the most admirably endowed, knows how to impose upon herself, when she consecrates all her faculties to the simple and modest domain assigned to her by her God.

"There is a third word of the apostle which has sometimes been alleged against the view of this matter which we are here expounding. It is in chapter xi. of 1st Cor. ver. 5—'Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered, dishonoureth her head; for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven.' It follows from this, it is said, that the apostle authorises women to pray and prophesy in the worship of the church, consequently to speak, provided they have their heads covered. Still, everyone will allow that it is not possible for the apostle to contradict himself in the same Epistle at a distance of three chapters; and that, while commanding women to be silent in the church (xiv. 34), seeing that it is shame for them to *speak in the church* (ver. 35), he should allow them in a general way to prophesy or pray in public. Remark, first of all, that the apostle simply mentions the fact as a fact without approving or blaming it. He does not as yet in this chapter touch upon the preaching of the Word (it is in the 14th chapter that he treats of this subject), but only of the decent appearance which ought to be attended to by women. Keeping, therefore, strictly within the bounds of his subject, he confines himself to blaming what is in connection with it—impropriety in the outward appearance. It is only further on that he will attack the radical evil—women *speaking in public*. He acts exactly in the same manner in regard to another point in chapters viii.-x. In chapter viii. ver. 10, he mentions a culpable license which some of the Corinthians allowed themselves—that of frequenting idolatrous banquets to which they were invited by their pagan friends, and which took place in the temples of the false gods.\* He does not in any way attack this criminal custom for the time being; he confines himself to reminding those who act in this manner, that they run the risk of drawing into the same way of acting their weak brethren, who may be tempted to imitate them even when their conscience would not authorise them to do so. Who in reading these words would not think that the apostle sees no impropriety in the participation in sacrificial banquets, considered in itself? Yet in chapter x., after having by degrees prepared the mind for it, he attacks

\* "For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him that is weak be emboldened (literally *edified*, ironically) to eat those things which are offered to idols? And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish?"

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

this mode of action directly; no longer only in view of the scandal given to brethren, but in view of the believer's own salvation. He declares to his readers that it is not possible to *drink* at once *the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils*; for it is with these that they have fellowship in such banquets, just as they have fellowship with the Lord in the Holy Supper (ver. 16-21). Such is the whole truth of which, through prudence, the apostle had only said the half at first. He acts in the same way in regard to the *public speaking* of women. He does not at once attack these two forms of speaking—prayer and prophecy—confining himself here to the regulation of the outward appearance; hence it results that he does tolerate them, if need be, as exceptional facts. It might indeed happen that a Christian woman in the church might be suddenly seized so strongly by a revelation, or an extraordinary emotion, that it would not be possible to prevent her from pouring out the overflow of her heart in a prophecy or an instantaneous prayer. The apostle did not wish, in these extraordinary cases, absolutely to suppress the manifestation of the Spirit. But, outside of these exceptional cases, which have nothing in common with the speeches, at fixed hours, of the women who in our day speak in churches, the general rule, according to Paul, was and remained that which he has laid down positively in chap. xiv. 'Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience.' In chapter xi. he is *relating*; in chapter xiv. he *commands*. Even if there were conflicts between these two sentences, which is impossible, the second would necessarily take precedence of the first.

"When the example of Deborah is appealed to (Judges v.), people forget that she did not teach, but acted, or rather made another person act, for she it was who animated the courage of Barak and incited him to battle and to victory. She was a Joan d'Arc but not a preacher. Also when these words are brought forward in objection, 'I will pour out of my spirit on all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,' two things are forgotten: first, that a prophecy supposes a revelation. The proof of this is not far to seek; it is found in the words which follow: 'Your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams.' Compare also 1 Cor. xiv. 6 and 30.\* Some people think that because it is said that the prophet *edifies, exhorts, consoles*, whoever edifies, exhorts, consoles, is consequently a prophet. It is as if because every man moves, breathes, eats, we were to conclude that every being which moves, breathes, eats, is a man. "The true characteristic of the prophet in the New as well as in the Old Testament is, that he is the organ of a revelation which he received from God personally and immediately.

The second thing which must not be forgotten, in considering this subject, is that it is not said that these sons and daughters are to prophesy in *public* meetings. This remark applies equally to the often alleged example of the four daughters of the evangelist Philip, who are mentioned as being prophetesses, Acts xxi. 9. They were living in their father's house where Paul was staying at the time when he saw them, and if they perhaps made use of their gift at times in the meetings of the Christians of Caesarea (which is not said), it was at all events under the eyes of their parents, and not when roaming like independent persons through foreign countries. How would Paul have treated such behaviour,—he who says at the end of the 14th chapter of 1 Cor., 'Let all things be done decently and in order?'

"There is a story as old as humanity, and yet always new. I think I hear this dialogue: 'Hath God said, Ye shall not touch the ministry of the Word?'

"We have all sorts of ways of serving the Lord Who redeemed us; first of all, in our homes, in the bosom of the family which He has given us; then, if we have time at our disposal, in abodes of suffering where are found the poor and

\* In ver. 6 *prophecy* corresponds to *revelation*, as *doctrine* does to *knowledge*, ver. 30: "If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace."



[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

sick ; in asylums of forsaken children ; in the mission works ; in short, by the Word itself, within the circle of persons of our own sex . . . ; but as to the ministry of the Word in public, the men who explain to us the Gospel have taught that this function does not become our sex.'

" 'They have acted thus through jealousy, and as ignorant servants of the letter ; but the Spirit frees from the letter. As organs of the Spirit you will in a few hours do more and better work than what those people could do in many years. In the name of perishing souls, to work ! Open your mouths and preach !

" 'And it appeared to the woman that the fruit of the lips was good, and sweet to the taste, and that it would be of use to save souls. She took of it and did eat ; but it soon changed into poison for her and for all those who were partakers in her disobedience.'

" 'Such are the reasons for which we cannot associate ourselves in any work in which woman arrogates to herself a part which the Lord and the apostle have denied her. There is here an excrescence on the Tree of Life. What was begun in the Spirit may very well, as the apostle says, end 'in the flesh' by-and-by, Gal. iii. 3.

" F. GODET."

## Notes of the Day.

CHURCHES AND OTHER CHRISTIAN AGENCIES.—We are evidently in the midst of movements, even Christian movements, that will make it difficult for Churches to maintain their old ground. The doctrine that the Church is the great Divine institution for promoting the kingdom of God, and that societies for Christian objects are on their right footing only as subordinate to the Church, is losing its hold ; and it seems now to be a recommendation to many a movement that it has no connection with any Church, but is on an entirely independent footing. We hear of places where even the regular Sabbath services are being disturbed or deserted in favour of services originated and controlled by individuals. We look on this tendency with considerable alarm. No doubt it is due in some measure to our ecclesiastical divisions, and the desire of union wherever it is practicable. But we are sure that no good will come in the end from the loosening of Church bonds,—the bonds that used to connect all godly and earnest families with their Church, and that made them look for a rich blessing on its services. The subject needs much consideration from all. Among remedial suggestions, the following may be noted :—1. More strenuous efforts among Churches or denominations after co-operation *as Churches* in Christian work ; 2. More readiness on the part of Churches to modify old methods of work in accordance with modern requirements ; 3. Efforts to instruct people in the Scriptural claims of the Church and the obligations of its members ; in which direction an excellent beginning has been made by the publication of Dr. Binnie's "Text-Book for Bible Classes" on "THE CHURCH."

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

IS EARNEST FAITH DECLINING?—The tendency seems to be decidedly in this direction. Even in secular affairs, *The Times* tells us, "Nothing is more remarkable than the complete extinction of that keen interest, that intense faith, and that eager hope, which manifestly inspired the politicians of half-a-century ago, and made their influence felt among all classes of the community." In religious circles it is common to hear comments on the indifference of a large number of persons who go to church, the absence from their minds of anything like powerful convictions as to religion, and the easy nonchalance with which they pass by great and solemn inquiries, the importance of which used to be felt by nearly all. In regard, again, to the class that do show sincere regard for religion, the tendency on the part of those who are prospering in the world to give great importance to the most superficial matters in social life, is a serious feature. It does not seem as if the Church of the future were going to have an easy time. Influences of a very hurtful kind may, to a large extent, suck out the life-blood of the Christian community, and greatly reduce its spiritual power. The cry seems to sound very loud in the ears of all who value an earnest faith,—*"Look to yourselves, that ye lose not the things that ye have wrought."* Ministers of the Gospel, especially, who have the responsibility of guiding the Christian Church, have need to remember that if they would see an earnest faith on the part of their people, nothing is more necessary than that their own hearts be pervaded by it, and if they would see that faith controlling other mens' lives, it must very really control their own.

DR. A. M. FAIRBAIRN AND THE NEEDED THEOLOGY.—In the first paper in a powerful book entitled *"The City of God,"* Dr. Fairbairn criticises Calvinism. "In modern times, no system has had a more potent practical influence than Calvinism. It is a system of splendid daring, of courageous consistency in all its parts, in premise, process, and conclusion. It was a reasoned system; reason could understand it, and the reason that understood it, it could control. It was the universe in its making, in its rule, purpose, and destiny, explained by a given conception of God; and though the conception might not be the most generous, the men who held it felt that they had their feet on the last and highest reality, as if they had not merely a way of salvation, or a path to peace in death, but a system of absolute truth that helped a man to look at all things as if it were from the standpoint of their Maker. . . . What we need is a system as constructive, comprehensive, and sublime as Calvinism, but more generous; an interpretation of the universe through our higher idea of God. Men cannot live in these days by a faith which touches them only at one or a few points; they need a faith that embraces, penetrates, and possesses their spirits, and enables them to feel in harmony with ultimate and universal truth."

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1888.]

We must own we do not like this way of writing. 1. Dr. Fairbairn does not profess to be able to give the faith described in the last lines, and therefore he virtually confesses "men cannot live in these days." 2. Calvinism does not pretend to be a philosophy of the universe, or anything of the kind; it professes only to systematise the truth bearing on the relation of God to man *as revealed in the Scriptures*. 3. It is certain that Calvinism does not profess to solve all difficulties as to the ways of God; it only claims to have advanced further in the right direction than other systems; but it is certain that its greatest preachers—*e.g.*, George Whitefield and Thomas Chalmers—have been behind no other teachers in their representation of the love and goodness of God. 4. Does not the demand for a faith that is to satisfy every craving and make men "feel in harmony with absolute and universal truth," and this, too, as essential to life, savour of human ambition and presumption? Certainly it is a great contrast to the spirit of Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Butler, and Dr. Chalmers. But they did not live "in these days." Men in their times used to enter heaven as little children.

CHRISTIANITY AND HUMANITY.—In the discourse already referred to, Dr. Fairbairn urges that the Churches "have no longer a monopoly of humanity; it exists without them as well as within them, and till they know what this signifies, they can never do their duty either by modern thought or the modern world." "What this signifies," we presume is, that there is a spring of goodness in human nature, out of which, and not merely out of Christianity, comes much of the morality and philanthropy of the present age. He says that "some of the most powerful and persuasive appeals to England to be commercially honest and politically honourable in her dealings with lower races have come from disciples of Comte." It is difficult to know what Dr. Fairbairn means, for he says afterwards, "Christianity has fashioned all that is noblest in our modern world; breathes in our atmosphere, pulses in our institutions, glows in our civilisations." The phenomenon to which he refers—that men who are not believers are doing much noble work for humanity and morality—is a very interesting one, but it is not peculiar to this age. It is as old as the age of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius; in a measure it was exemplified by Voltaire. We reconcile it with Dr. Fairbairn's own words that "Christianity has fashioned all that is noblest in our modern world" on the principle that men who are not Christians may derive much indirectly from Christianity. The two modern names he gives (Carlyle and Matthew Arnold), and the one he hints at (George Eliot), are those of persons who in their youth were actually steeped in Christian influence. Had it not been so, would they have shown the moral enthusiasm which has so remarkably characterised them?

We agree with Dr. Fairbairn in his aim. We long for a closer connection between Christian teaching and a high ethical standard, (as laid down very powerfully, for instance, in the article by Dr. Morris on

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

"Ethical Preaching" in our March number). We pant for a more conspicuous manifestation of the bright and benignant spirit of our religion; and we are deeply convinced that the example of some worldly men may be brought with effect to bear on the Church in the form of Christ's question—"What do ye more than others?" But we see no ground for hinting that productive fountains of this spirit are to be found outside Christianity, or apart from the Divine provision for making "all things new;" or for taunting the Church with ignorance of these fountains.

## American Notes.

DAY OF PRAYER.—One of the admirable and time-honoured customs of the American Churches is that of observing annually a day of prayer on behalf of students and colleges generally, but specially with reference to the young men studying for the ministry. Ofttimes the devout observance of the day has been the beginning of a work of grace in a particular college or in some individual soul, so that the American Church would not readily omit its observance. For many years the day observed has been the last Thursday in February, but this year the Northern Church changed the date, making it the last Thursday in January. This broke up the common observance, for the Southern Church adhered to the former date, and the Canadian Church, which this year for the first time joined, was also out in its calculation. The day is observed in colleges by a cessation from all study, and an engaging in special religious exercises, while in towns and cities there are special prayer meetings. During the meeting held at Princeton College it was stated that in eleven colleges there are 2020 students, of whom 1066 professed faith in Christ, while about one-third of these latter are preparing for the ministry. In detail, some of the statements are as follows: At Wabash College, Ind., there are 175 students, of whom 70 are professing Christians, 37 of these having the ministry in view. At Centre College, O., three-fourths of the students are Church members, but only 5 are contemplating the ministry. Hanover College has 130 students, 65 of whom are Christians, and 10 of these look forward to the ministry. Wooster University has 300 students, with two-thirds professing Christians, while 18 of the senior class will study for the ministry. One-half of the students attending Princeton College are professing Christians, while out of the 102 in the graduating class it is expected that 17 will give themselves to the ministry. All this is a good showing as to the state of religion among the young men in our American colleges. Intellect, education, energy, sanctified by grace and consecrated to the Lord, will furnish the land and the Church with an agency that will be resistless, not merely in repelling Nihilism and Agnosticism, but in diffusing practical Christianity at home and abroad.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

JOSEPH COOK IN BOSTON.—This famous lecturer having returned from his tour, not "round the world" as we generally say, but according to his own phrase, "round this planet," has resumed his Monday morning lectures in Tremont Temple. Judging from newspaper reports, the audiences are larger than ever, while thus far the subjects have been of very special interest. The question "Is there, or may there be, probation for a soul after death?" has been a fruitful theme for discussion during some months past all over the land, with indications that not a few persons are beginning to regard the question as an open one. Mr. Cook gave a lecture on the subject a few weeks ago, in which, with all his tremendous energy and power, he rejected the affirmative of the proposition as a working rule. He could go no farther than to suppose that as there is a measurable instant of time after the ceasing of the natural breath and before the dying can be said to be dead, that *possibly*, during that brief instant, life with its memories and experiences may pass in review, the soul still possessing the power of choice, life's privileges will also come again before the soul, and should this, at that supreme moment of its history, accept of Christ, there will be mercy for one so doing, but that delay at that instant or rejection must from the nature of the case be *final*. The existence of even this last chance the lecturer held as only *supposable*, and by no means asserted as a belief, so that his position does not give much comfort to those who would claim him as a believer in what he rejects with even unusual force and emphasis. His statements have already been assailed from more than one quarter, but Mr. Cook is neither easily frightened nor easily beaten in argument, and Thor-like swings his hammer around in a manner very perilous for such as come within its reach.

THE COLOURED PEOPLE.—A striking article has lately appeared in a New York scientific magazine in reference to the future of the coloured race. The writer shows that the coloured people are increasing in the United States in a much more rapid ratio than the white race. The white race increases twenty per cent. each decade, while the coloured race increases at the rate of thirty-five per cent. during the same period. What is this to end in? is a question that may not unnaturally be asked. The white immigrant of whatever nationality, it is shown, becomes merged in the general American population by the second generation, but the coloured population does not merge at all, remaining an outside quantity. It does not lose its race characteristics, no matter how long it has been in the country. The writer's conclusion is startling enough. The coloured man, he says, is in the United States and on the American continent—to stay. The race will advance in education and general progress, owing to the presence and influence of the white people, but will naturally take possession of the tier of States along the southern shores, and be found ultimately occupy-



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

ing the whole land between the Rio Grande and South America. Possibly it may hereafter flow southward, and be the appropriate inhabitant of the northern section of that vast territory. There may be something in the speculation, and if so, all the more eagerly should efforts be made that this great race be brought under the controlling power of a pure Christianity before it starts out on so singular a future.

THE CHINESE IN NEW YORK.—One of the recent mortifying actions of the American Congress was the passing of an Act prohibiting the arrival into this land of any more Chinese workers. The measure was alleged to be in the interest of the American mechanic, as if skilled labour could be affected by the presence of that which was unskilled, and as if John Chinaman, should he by any chance become a skilled mechanic, would then take less than the regular market rate of wages for his labour. John has learned that cheap labour will always be more in demand than that which is dear, and so is content at present to put up with a large amount of unjust treatment, since the winning is on his side. At first the Chinese were gathered into the States on the Pacific slope, where they rendered invaluable service in the construction of railways and other public works. Lately they have been diffused over a larger portion of the national territory; but, as the whole number, as reported by the Census of 1880 is only about 140,000, while the population of the whole United States is 50,000,000, there is no great cause for much alarm. Of this 140,000, about 2000 have been drawn to New York, where they are engaged in a variety of humble occupations. Quiet in their dispositions and industrious in their callings, they all desire to be acquainted with the English language. This furnishes Christian workers with a mode of reaching them. The process is a very slow one, as almost each scholar requires a teacher to himself, but the result is far beyond our expectations. While teaching English, the teachers have been acting as missionaries, and God has so accepted their labours that a considerable number of the Chinese have embraced Christianity as a matter of personal religion. More than this, there is at present a fair proportion of these studying for the ministry, to work either as evangelists among their countrymen in the United States or to return to China and there to preach to its perishing millions. The work in New York city has lately assumed such promising aspects that at a recent meeting of the Presbytery it was agreed to ask the General Assembly to take the matter up, and to grant a sum of money to be the nucleus of a fund for this strange Foreign Mission work on American soil. Surely, if it be wise to send missionaries to China to seek to convert the heathen there, it is much wiser to attack that same heathenism when it comes to us, and erects its low houses and has its opium dens side by side with our own dwellings.

OBITUARY.—Since the date of my last letter, the Master has called from among us some whom we would gladly have detained a little

VOL. IX.—NO. LII.

X

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

longer. Full of years and honoured for his Biblical scholarship and services in the work of Bible translation, the Rev. Dr. Schauffler, formerly of Constantinople, has entered into his rest. Along with a deep interest in the spiritual welfare of the Osmanli Turk, Dr. Schauffler gave himself most earnestly to mission work among the Jews, and, in connection with that, spent some time at Pesth, where his labours were greatly blessed. His Turkish translation of the Scripture will be an imperishable monument to his memory.

Princeton College has just had a sad loss in the death of the Rev. Dr. Atwater, its Professor of Logic, Metaphysics, and Political Science. Dr. Atwater had come of genuine Puritan stock, his ancestors having settled in New Haven as far back as 1638. Born in 1813, he studied at Yale College, and subsequently became minister of one of the leading congregational churches in Connecticut. His contributions to periodical literature soon attracted attention, so that in 1854 he accepted an offer of a chair at Princeton College, which he held till his death. For some years he was associated with Dr. Charles Hodge in the editorship of the old *Princeton Review*, the burden of which soon fell almost entirely on his shoulders. His articles were on theological, philosophical, and economical subjects, and in many cases of such permanent value as to be reprinted in Europe. At the meeting of the Presbyterian Alliance in Philadelphia, Dr. Atwater read a valuable paper on Religion and Politics, having previously furnished articles for *The Catholic Presbyterian*.

You across the water have the Earl of Shaftesbury as one foremost in every good work and employing a long life in Christian activity. Till a few days ago, we had Wm. E. Dodge of New York city, our foremost worker in Christian philanthropy, but we have him with us no longer. A week ago he entered into his well-earned rest. William Earle Dodge was born in 1805, and was the seventh in descent from one William Dodge, who came from Dorsetshire in 1629, making Salem his home. In 1817 the boy Wm. Dodge was converted, and at once took sides for *personal activity in Christian service*, and during all the years of a long and busy life never once went back on the resolves of his boyhood. He came to New York when eighteen years of age, and remained in it till the close. During all those sixty years, Mr. Dodge adorned in a very striking manner that early Christian profession. No movement that sought man's well-being, and especially his religious well-being, failed to obtain his sympathy and support. Though bearing the burden of an immense business, Mr. Dodge seemed to be ubiquitous in matters of Christianity. Revivals of religion, temperance crusades, educational movements, missionary advances, Sabbath School societies, Bible societies, Young Men's Christian Associations, Evangelical Alliance, Presbyterian Alliance—it mattered not what form the movement bore, if only it sought the well-being and especially the conversion of men to God, and Mr. Dodge was sure to be in its very centre. Personal

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

labour, time for counsel, money for aid—nothing was withheld, if his Master's cause could be aided. God had prospered him in business, and he felt bound as a steward to invest a portion of his wealth for God. His liberality was therefore ever on a princely scale. For a long time his contributions for religious and benevolent objects amounted to \$100,000 a-year, and not unfrequently, it is said, to three times that sum, that is to say, to \$1000 a-day the whole year round. The fruits of this liberality were, however, surpassed by the influence of his personal activity. His word to others was ever "Come," and under the influence of this he led into personal usefulness many who might otherwise have contented themselves with but proxy service.

Mr. Dodge's place as the friend and helper of sin-burdened humanity is vacant. Will there be competition among our wealthy Church members that it may be filled?

G. D. MATHEWS.

## General Survey.

### GREAT BRITAIN.

#### PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

THE Assemblies and Synods are drawing near again. The indications are that they will be peaceable and practical. The Disestablishment question, no doubt, will claim a day in each Assembly, but the discussion is not likely to be more than animated. In the Free Church, the subject of Instrumental Music in Public Worship, with which its Assembly will have to deal, creates a little anxiety. In the Highlands especially the organ is greatly disliked.

While the Supreme Courts of the Scotch Presbyterian Churches are all composed of ministers and elders, they have their differences. Thus the representation of elders from Presbyteries is proportionally a good deal larger in the Free Church than in the Established Church; and while in the former, members of Assembly are exclusively chosen by Presbyteries,—in the latter, elders of Assembly are chosen partly by Presbyteries and partly by the Royal Parliamentary Burghs. The Synod of the United Presbyterian Church, again, differs from the two Assemblies. It is only representative in respect of the elders, every minister being a member. Further, the elders are not elected to the Synod by Presbyteries, but by Sessions, and the Session must make its selection from its own members. In regard to this last peculiarity of the United Presbyterian order, there is a good deal of complaint. It is said to be unfair to the poorer congregations, the members of whose Sessions often cannot afford the time and the expense of a ten-days'

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1888.]

visit to Edinburgh. It is proposed, therefore, that Sessions should be allowed, like the Presbyteries of the Established and Free Churches, to select from the elders of the Church at large, and thus always be able to secure a representation in the Synod,—a change, it is argued, desirable on the further ground that it would probably also secure for the Synod the more frequent presence of capable laymen interested in, and willing to take part in, ecclesiastical work. As things are at present, it is also pleaded that the clerical element has a most unfair advantage over the lay element. The numbers of the clergy in the Supreme Court are almost inevitably greater, and their more thorough acquaintance with Church business must give them a great advantage. The question was sent down last year to the Inferior Courts. Appearances seem to indicate a preponderance of opinion against any change—certainly against any change which would make elders eligible outside the bounds of the Presbyteries.

#### EPISCOPAL CHURCHES.

There is a movement at present among Scotch Episcopalians not without its interest to Presbyterian Churches. The anti-evangelical, or rather we should say the semi-Popish character, which for a long period Scotch Episcopacy boldly assumed, was not found to be helpful to its progress. What is called the Scotch Communion Office, in which there is a prayer that the bread and wine “may become the body and blood of God’s beloved Son,” remained for about a century “the authorised service of the Episcopal Church in the administration of the Lord’s Supper.” In 1838 a canon was enacted that it should be used at the opening of all general synods. At the same time the English service was permitted. But in 1863 the tables, so to speak, were turned. The English service was elevated to the higher position, and the Scotch service reduced to the lower. But the latter is still lawful. In a new congregation, the question between the two services is determined by the majority of members ; and in fact it is in use in seventy-four congregations. On the ground, however, of this change of position in the services, some of the English Episcopal congregations—eight in number—which form a separate Association under the Presidency of Mr. John Burns of Castle Wemyss, are proposing to make a sort of union with the Scotch Episcopalians. One indeed has already done so ; and it is said that St. Thomas’, Edinburgh, hitherto regarded as almost ultra-evangelical, is about to follow the example. It is as plain as can be that there is no real change. The service of 1765—worse than that which Laud forced or tried to force on the Scottish Church a hundred and thirty years before—is recognised as legal, and as Bishop Ryle puts it, you have Romanism and the Reformation authorised in the same Church. That at least, and we should say more : for the service of 1765 must be held to dominate the interpretation of the English

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

service, which we know is regarded by High Churchmen as capable of a Romanist meaning; and one can hardly suppose that the Scotch bishops will give countenance to two doctrines of the Eucharist fundamentally different from each other. Happily the Glasgow Episcopal congregations are standing aloof from this Union movement. They clearly see whither it tends. The use of the Scotch form, we are told, is rapidly extending. So far as mere sectarian interests are concerned, the more Ritualistic Scotch Episcopalians become the better for Presbyterianism; but if a portion of our young people, under the drift of fashion, will have bishops and liturgies, we would rather see them taking refuge in Bishop Beckles' congregations than under the old Scotch Prelacy, with its dark traditions and its semi-Roman Theology.

It is said some 2500 clergymen of the Church of England have signed the protest against the action of the Bishop of London in the Mackonochie case. The *Church Times* is exultant. A few years ago an anti-ritualist document received twice as many signatures; and the ritualist organ sees a happy decadence of the great evangelical party in the diminished numbers. But the 2500 represent the men who stand to their colours, and, if they do that bravely and thoroughly, their numerical strength is not to be despised. A couple of thousand educated men with faith, earnestness, common sense, and some organisation, might rouse England. The non-protesting section of evangelicals appear to tend more and more away from the old paths of the party. Prebendary Cadman gets very suspicious favours as the reward of his trimming. The Bishop of London has nominated him as one of the London members of the "General Diocesan Council" soon to meet in the capital, the only evangelical (?) of the six diocesan representatives; and the High Church Primate has made him one of his chaplains. At Dr. Jackson's "Conference" it was resolved that in 1884 there should be a great "mission" in London; but, when a layman pled for some recognition of Dissenters in it, the evangelical Mr. Bickersteth at once objected. "People might be drawn," he said, "into the chapel who would have been otherwise gained to the Church." But the Rector of Hampstead had no fears of Mr. Body or Mr. Knox. Little attracting any into semi-Romanist folds.

On the subject of this London mission, the Rev. W. H. Aitken, the most noted of the evangelical "missioners," has addressed a letter to the Bishop of London. He thinks the whole of London too vast a field. They have not men for it. Of the 20,000 Anglican clergy, Mr. Aitken thinks there are not more than 200 fit for the work, and they could not get all these for London. And he evidently has the opinion that any but the truly gifted are not helps but hindrances. But, meanwhile, Mr. Aitken has taken a step which will not probably add to his influence or usefulness. He has become a member of a committee formed to support Mr. Dening, a Japan missionary of the Church Missionary Society, who has been dismissed for adopting the doctrine of Conditional



[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

Immortality, and who, encouraged and sustained by Mr. Aitken and his friends, has gone off to propagate his views and spread theological dissension among the Christian Japanese.

## NONCONFORMISTS.

It has come out that there is slavery in Madagascar, and that, too, even in connection with the converts and native clergy. Unless the London Missionary Society can make some explanations, the interests of the Malagasy will undoubtedly suffer from the knowledge of this fact, both in this country and America.

Mr. Moody's meetings at Manchester have proved an extraordinary success. The attendance has been vastly greater than in 1874. Eight years ago the "Bible reading" at a quarter to three had an attendance of about 2000; on this occasion, long before the hour of meeting the great hall has been packed with 5000 people. The Nonconformist clergy have been present in great numbers at the meetings; the Anglicans have rather held aloof, or perhaps they were occupied with their own Lent work.

## FRANCE.

*By the Rev. H. J. WHEATCROFT, B.D., Orleans.*

## THE PRESBYTERIAL ELECTIONS—THE SALVATION ARMY—MR. DAUDET'S NEW NOVEL.

EVERY three years, the presbyterial councils or kirk-sessions of the Reformed Church of France are partially re-elected. In the greater number of parishes no agitation takes place, and the same councillors are almost always returned. In others, on the contrary, the rivalry is great and the competitors numerous. This principally occurs where rationalism has gained a footing, and endeavours to substitute its candidates for those who represent the evangelical traditions and discipline of the Church. This year all interest was centred on the Presbyterial elections in Paris. It will be remembered that the latitudinarians, making use of the interest enjoyed by some of their representative men with the present Government, have prevailed upon the Minister of Public Worship to divide the Church of Paris into several parishes. This division, carried out against the evident and clearly expressed desire of the Church, was managed in such a way as to ensure a majority of rationalistic voters in the central parish of the Oratoire. By this means, the elections which have just taken place have resulted in a majority (though an extremely small one) for the so-called "Liberal" party in that quarter of Paris. In all the other parishes the evangelical candidates have headed the list, with larger majorities than ever before. Thus the Paris elections, taken as a whole, show the waning influence of latitudinarism, and it is with sadness that we are obliged to state that the Liberals triumphed at the Oratoire, only by the help of an

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

alliance with notable unbelievers, whose platform was the negation of the most elementary truths of Christianity. That these destructive elements are powerless to build up any Christian work or mission, however humble, is amply proved, and our hope for the future is in the gradual awakening of the Church spirit among the Reformed Christians. The perils of the last few years have done much to arouse many whose religious quietude savoured of indifference.

Turning from ecclesiastical questions to those connected with Christian life and work, we must briefly notice the remarks of the religious press on the Salvation Army and its recent crusade in Switzerland. The incidents of this expedition are probably well known to the readers of *The Catholic Presbyterian*. The "Maréchale Catherine," after an able reconnaissance by Colonel Clibborn, organised the invasion of Geneva. The movement, at first, was favourably viewed by many of the most eminent men and women of the city; but it was brought to an abrupt termination by the extraordinary (not to use a stronger expression), behaviour of the cantonal Government. Instead of protecting the Salvationists against the atheist and radical ruffianism of Geneva, the authorities, by their culpable non-interference, encouraged the worst manifestations of brutality on the part of the populace. They went further, and, taking as a pretext the turmoil produced by the roughs, interdicted the meetings, both public and private, of the Army. Moreover, the "Conseil d'Etat," apparently determined to prove its intolerance, issued a decree of expulsion against Miss Booth and a young lady friend, Miss Charlesworth, as endangering public order. It is sad that Protestant rulers should follow the ways and assume the methods of Roman despotism and Russian autocracy, against a few harmless women, when, at the same time, they harbour at Geneva the representatives of Nihilism, and allow French and German anarchists to preach and organise a social war in the neighbouring states. In pleasing contrast with this cowardly radicalism is the conduct of the French "sous-préfet" across the frontier, who, witnessing an open-air meeting of Salvationists, courteously promised them complete freedom and the protection of the law.

This vulgar antagonism of the Geneva rabble, encouraged by the tacit consent of the "Conseil d'Etat," is but of small importance compared to the war, *sans merci*, against the Army which is being waged by an eminent and well-known Christian lady, an authoress, of French origin, the Countess de Gasparin. She has just issued a pamphlet in which are to be found a large number of quotations from the Order-book of the Army. This translation, *if correct*, certainly obliges us to acknowledge that the proceedings and methods of the Army are marked in several instances by a much-to-be-regretted want of sincerity. This pamphlet has already run through several editions, and the religious press is, in general, treating Mr. Booth's enterprise with the greatest severity, and, I fear, in many cases with some unfairness.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1853.]

Continental imaginations are easily roused to excess ; and, according to several of our respected contemporaries, General Booth would seem to be nothing less than a nineteenth century Loyola, with the strategic powers of a Moltke, and the diplomatic cunning of a Bismarck. Until now no answer has been given to the accusations of Jesuitry which have been formulated against the Army ; and we cannot but think that it is much to be regretted that the General has not issued a cheap French edition of the Order-book, on an incomplete translation of which Madame de Gasparin has based her often cruel denunciations. The latest news from Geneva is that friends of the Army are now rallying, and that many persons believe Madame de Gasparin's pamphlet to be a misrepresentation of the Order-book.

This spirit of animosity among Christian workers has been, it would seem, turned to good account by the unbelievers of Geneva ; and the celebrated materialist professor, Karl Vogt, correspondent of the *Vienna Free Press*, represents to his readers this *boutade* of Madame de Gasparin as a simple quarrel between two religious parties, denying to the noble author the right of reproaching the Salvation Army with faults which, in a less degree, are also her own.

Ridicule is, in fact, at the close of the nineteenth century as it was in Voltaire's time, a favourite weapon in the hands of unbelief. The literary world is at present agitated by the apparition of a novel from the first living author of fiction, M. Daudet, whose celebrity was acquired by a novel, the "Nabab," which was supposed faithfully to represent the feelings and manners of French society under the Second Empire. The last work of M. Daudet, "L'Evangelist," professes to delineate the habits and ideas of French Protestant society of the present day. It is one of the most extraordinary samples of literary bungling which it is possible to meet with, and takes away all faith in the realism of the so-called realistic school. In this work we have the most curious representation of Romish fanaticism dressed up in Protestant garb, and the Jesuit maxim that "the end justifies the means," carried out by a pious Christian lady of our Church. M. Daudet has also discovered what may truly be termed a singularly revised version of the Holy Scriptures, in which the "Thou shalt love" is translated by "Tu n'aimeras pas !" Unfortunately, the author's great reputation may help to give a false impression of Protestantism to his numerous readers, who will probably, after running through these pages, consider that they have been treated to an exact description of what our communion really is.

---

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

## INDIA.

## THE CALCUTTA MISSIONARY CONFERENCE.

METHODS OF MISSIONARY WORK—PREACHING—HIGHER EDUCATION—SUNDAY SCHOOLS—  
WORK AMONG MOHAMMEDANS—ABORIGINES—ENGLISH-SPEAKING HINDUS—SELF-  
SUPPORT AND SELF-PROPAGATION OF NATIVE CHURCH—WOMAN'S WORK.

In our last number, Dr. Murray Mitchell furnished our readers with a summary of the missionary statistics prepared under the direction and issued under the authority of the Missionary Conference which recently held its decennial meeting at Calcutta. The Conference sat for several days, and discussed a large number of subjects connected with Indian Missions; we propose to give some account of these discussions.

1. The Conference commenced with the methods of mission work. Very naturally the place of honour was given to missionary "preaching," on which subject papers were read and many speeches delivered. There was nothing perhaps very new to be said. It seemed to be thought that, in the past, missionary preachers had been often ill prepared for the work, especially in respect of a thorough knowledge of the vernacular languages.

The place of "Higher Christian Education" as a missionary instrument obtained a cordial recognition. The Rev. Mr. Blacket of the Church Missionary Society, a member of the Educational Commission which has been for some months moving about over India, said that his interest in missionary schools had been not a little quickened by the evidence which had lately been given in his hearing. Many natives had testified in their favour. On the other hand, the hostility which had been manifested to them by natives and others was unequivocal evidence of their power. A Canadian Baptist—"a vernacular missionary," as he called himself—mentioned that in his own field he had had experience of the advantages of the Higher Education, and he expressed the strong desire that it should be strengthened at every possible point and in every possible way. "As the time goes by," he said, "its work will appear to be more and more important." Dr. Chester, of the American Board of Missions, spoke in the same strain, stating that during the twenty-one years he had spent in India he had felt the "greatest obligation" to those men who were working it. "The General Assembly's Institution," another American testified, "is doing a great work."

At the same time, it should be said that there were some dissonant notes. Mr. M'Grew, of the Methodist Episcopal Mission, affirmed that the "policy of high English education in the Presidency towns had proved a failure." "Where," he asked, "are the thousands of young men moulded by Duff and Murdoch and Wilson? They are not in this assembly. They are in the Bramo Somaj." However this may be, we believe that the state of matters among English-speaking educated Hindoos is very different from what it would have been if they had all got their training in the presidency colleges. The acting principal of the Serampore Institution declared that though he could not tell of a single convert, he still believed in his work. His pupils left him with their attitude towards Christianity entirely altered.

In regard to "Mass," or "Lower" education, which, in one aspect or another, was very frequently referred to in the Conference, all missions make use of that; and in various forms it is used as distinctively evangelistic. There are as many as 4350 native Christian teachers, an increase of more than 2000 since 1871; and what is of special interest, the increase of *non-Christian teachers* in mission schools is slight. The Propagation Society sets in this a good example. Ten years ago its Christian and non-Christian teachers were just about equal in number, now it has 645 of the former and only 100 of the latter.

Among other forms of Mission work of which notice was taken in the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

Congress, we may mention Sabbath schools, which have been conducted with great vigour and success, especially by the American Methodists, medical missions, orphanages, boarding schools, &c. The very touching and striking fact was stated by the chairman of the Conference, Sir H. Ramsey, that during the year 300 girls had been baptised in a leper asylum.

2. Another set of papers dealt with work among Mohammedans, Aboriginal tribes, and English-speaking Hindus. One half of the Indian Mohammedans, it is stated, are to be found in Bengal. They are there "the poor and illiterate;" and in their ignorance and bigotry, so far as conversions are concerned, retain an almost unbroken front. But in some other parts of India Mohammedanism is less rigid and immovable. In the north and north-west, Western influences are telling. A new Moslem school has arisen, the leader of which "professes to have studied all modern religions, and claims that in Mohammedanism he finds the reconciliation of the spirit of the Koran and the Bible with modern discovery." And Syed Ahmed Khan is not a mere speculator. He has built a college at Aligarh, in which his views are carried out. The foundation-stone was laid eight years ago by Lord Lytton, and now we are told it has the names of nearly 300 students on its rolls. According to the chairman of the Educational Commission, this remarkable institution, "recognising the special spiritual needs of the Mohammedan youths, *bases its teaching on the truths of Western science.*" Something of the same spirit of compromise, it is said, has been manifesting itself in Southern India. What may come of this it is hard to say. It is not without its dangers, as a Scotch missionary suggested; and certainly its significance, from a Christian point of view, may be greatly over estimated. Islam lax and philosophical may be found less friendly to Christianity than Islam traditional and bigoted.

Peculiarly interesting and very important, as we think, were the papers and speeches on *Work among Lower Caste Hindoos and Aboriginal Tribes*. It was stated that these two classes form a majority of the population of Bengal, and a large proportion of the entire population of India. They are very accessible—no "national, physical, social, or governmental obstacles" bar the way to them. But they are not only accessible—they are friendly; the preacher scarcely ever fails to get a cordial welcome from "these common people." Among some of the thinly scattered mountain tribes the success has not been great; but among the Coles and the Santhals the converts are counted by thousands. The Christian population of Chota-Nagpore, in connection with Gossner's Mission, amounts to over 30,000. The organisation of native pastors, elders, catechists, and teachers, appears to be very complete. A theological seminary, in which twelve natives are studying for the ministry, is also in operation. "The converts," said one of the missionaries, "have a very encouraging missionary spirit, and their lives tell powerfully on their heathen neighbours. The Cole Christians are wonderfully simple and powerful in prayer." Among the Santhals the work is full of hope. "A good-hearted lot they are," said one who commenced work among them ten years ago, and now reports fifteen villages in which Christ is worshipped. "No work," says a Church Missionary Society man, "is more interesting or successful than that being carried on among the Santhals. And the winning of these tribes to Christ, let it be remembered, would not be the winning of a few thousand mountaineers, but of a nation, for they number not less than three millions."

The past decade, too, witnessed notable success among the lower classes of Hindoos. At Ongole in the Madras Presidency, the American Baptists report 20,000 converts, mostly gathered in since 1878. In that year a great movement commenced. It has gone steadily on ever since at the rate of from 1500 to 2000 converts a-year.

Not a very hopeful field of mission work is afforded in the English-speaking Hindoos. From the thoughtful paper of Mr. Alexander of the Free Church Mission at Madras, on through all that followed, there was very little to encourage.



CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

The class referred to, now very numerous, it seems hard to reach. Separated to some extent from their own people, and yet kept at arm's length by Europeans, they are not in a position likely to minister to sweetness of temper. One remark painfully struck us. It was said or hinted that these people were not expected to make their appearance in the English Churches. There are other castes besides those of Hindoos. The Baboos of the smaller towns—where, as well as in the presidential capitals, they are numerous—are very accessible to Christian influence.

3. Another subject was the "Self-support and Self-propagation of the Native Church." Things are greatly more advanced in this respect than many have any notion of. Twenty years ago the Tinnevely Mission was carried on by sixteen European missionaries. Now it has only four Europeans, one of them the bishop, and the other three engaged in educational work. The pastoral work is in the hands of natives, and the native contributions amount to £2500 a-year. "Our Tamil Missions," said a native C. M. pastor, "have made much progress in self-rule and some advance in Church extension. The native council is *bona fide*—the chairman, secretary, and members all being natives." The C. M. S. Santhal converts build their own chapels and pay more than half the stipends of the native clergy. We have seen that the Gossner Mission is largely wrought by native pastors and catechists; they get half their support from the native congregations. "My first mission field," said the Rev. M. Timpany of the Canadian Baptist Mission, "was Nellore. At the end of six years there were between 700 and 800 communicants; and ten village school-house chapels were completed, and twelve more were a-building. The only outside help the people got was from the central church, which gave to each erection a door, a window, and five rupees." "I know," said Mr. Timpany, "that Indian Christians will give out of their poverty." In Ceylon, the American Board of Foreign Missions has thirteen native churches, all but three of them self-supporting. Their 1000 members not merely support their own ministers in a suitable manner, but they contribute £70 a year for native missions. A native Ceylonese having a humble Government appointment, will contribute an annual sum, at the thought of which a broad-acred laird would not long ago have grown pale, and which would have startled even a stiff well-to-do Seceder accustomed to put his hand in his pocket.

We shall briefly allude to the papers on *Woman's Work in the Indian Mission-field*. These—all by ladies—were not the least notable. The Eurasian and Foreign Female Mission agents have increased by more than a fourth, and the Zenana pupils have grown from 2000 to 9000. More remarkable still, a *thousand more* native Christian females are in the Mission-field in 1881 than in 1871. Everything indicates still greater progress in the coming years.

It was said at the close of the Conference that the harvest time in India is near. It may be so. Certainly the progress made is full of encouragement. If it be the case, as is maintained, that Hinduism, instead of tottering to its fall, is actively and successfully propagandist, that may only mean dread of Christianity, or it may be the result of that vitalising influence which Christianity communicates even to its enemies. If 300,000 of the converts are in the south of India, and the great movements are not in the great centres of Brahminism, this may signify that, as of old, it is God's purpose, by the things which are not, to bring to nought the things which are; not that the weak are stronger than the strong, but that the weak are more recipient of the mightiest of all forces which have entered into human history.

J.

## Open Council.

### CHURCH MUSIC QUESTION.

*To the Editor of "The Catholic Presbyterian."*

SIR,—In your note on Mr. Curwen's paper, "the Church Music Question," you express a "readiness to receive remarks on any part of the subject."

We do not question Mr. Curwen's high authority, or the importance of most of his statements; but he overlooks the cause of "the contest," among Presbyterians, about "Church music." The contest does not regard the utility of instruments, but their lawfulness. "The ultimate principle" with them is not utilitarian, but Biblical—the question is not so much whether instruments are helpful as whether they are Scriptural in the present dispensation.

The Presbyterian "principle" is that the worship of God should be "pure." It forbids "the approving of any religious worship not instituted by God," though "under the title of antiquity, custom, devotion, good intent, or any other pretence whatsoever." Such being the "principle," the first question must be, is instrumental help in praise "instituted by God"—is it "agreeable to His will" as revealed in His Word?

It is said "organs help to kindle heart and voice in God's praise." Some, however, take a different view. It is said that "even religious men feel the argument about lawfulness to be out of harmony with the spirit of the times." The reply is "the spirit of the times, the spirit of the world, or of the age, is the spirit of the natural mind at enmity with God"—"the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God"—and "because the world by wisdom knew not God." He has given us a revelation of His will resting upon sheer authority. From this there can be no appeal.

The Presbyterians of the second Reformation, Puritans and Covenanters, did not consider "praise-worship" with the same thoroughness of care as they did "the doctrine, discipline, and government" of the Church; and as instrumental music had been abused by Popery and Prelacy, and is not mentioned in connection with New Testament worship, they laid the organ aside altogether.

We long held the traditional view of the non-lawfulness of organs in New Testament worship, and therefore we sympathise with those who still hold it. Many years ago, however, we were led to examine what the Word says on infant Church membership, and the result of our inquiry led to a change of stand-point from which to view "the Church music question."

Our position is that the Church of God is one Church, though having passed through different dispensations; that the Word of God is one book, though in two volumes; and that everything not Levitical or National in the one dispensation is lawful in the other, unless the Word declare that it is abolished.

What time instruments were first used in the worship of God we do not determine. We know that "the harp and organ" were known as instruments of music long before the Flood; though, in the brief sketch by Moses, we do not read that they were then used in leading the praise-worship of God. We read in Job of "the harp and the organ" as instruments of music, but we do not read that they were used by him in praise-worship of God. We do, however, know that instruments were used in leading the praise of God on the wilderness side of the Red Sea, when Moses and the children of Israel "sang a song" of praise "to the Lord;" and "Miriam took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her with timbrels . . . and answered, sing ye to the Lord for He hath triumphed gloriously." God accepted this worship of His people. It was non-Levitical, being prior to the call of Aaron.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

The praise-worship of those whom Saul met, going up to Bethel, "prophesying"—praising God in song—"with the psaltery, the tabret, the pipe, and the harp," was not connected with the Levitical ceremonial, but was "a service of song" common to all ages of the Church. The psalmody of David was non-Levitical. "The psalteries, harps, and cymbals" were for the service of song in the house of the Lord—not connected with sacrifice, but praise. "They prophesied with the harp"—they praised God in song with the harp. The New Testament says nothing leading us to suppose that instruments are unlawful under the present dispensation; and as the Church is one and the Word one, the silence of the New Testament does not set them aside.

Taking our stand on the principle of the oneness of the Church under all dispensations, and the oneness of the Word, though of many parts, and in two volumes, we can maintain the ordinances of the Sabbath, of degrees for marriage, of infant Church membership, of the tenth of substance for the treasury, of magistracy, and of instrumental help in the praise-worship of God. On no other principle can we *fully* maintain any of these; but holding this principle we can maintain them all and then accept all the instruction that Mr. Curwen gives us on "the Church Music Question."

JOSEPH FISHER, D.D.

37 WEST SQUARE, LONDON, S.E.

SIR,—It was with much satisfaction that I read the paper of Mr. Curwen in your last number. The question has many aspects; but perhaps no more pleasing one could have been chosen than that in which it has been introduced to your readers. The topic to which he has specially addressed himself he terms "the application of music to worship," or more shortly, "worship-music," and beyond this theme he merely "touches" what may be called "debateable ground." It is proper that this should be kept in view, for otherwise there might have been complaint that in the discussion of this great question there should be no reference to Divine revelation, or specially to that worship of which praise is but the expression, and music a mere accident or circumstance.

Taking into consideration, therefore, the low platform from which the question has been approached, Mr. Curwen's paper cannot be regarded otherwise than as interesting and instructive. He states the case as between the Ritualist and the Puritan with so much fairness and geniality, and altogether manifests so much of the impartial musical critic, that, save for an occasional expression of his own belief, it would be difficult to make out to which side his arguments, if not his sympathies, lean. For example, he scouts the idea of retaining the young people of the Presbyterian Church in their communion by making the "services more artistic and musical," without its being shown that "it is right freely to admit art in so far as it serves the ends of worship." And, again, that organs must be considered "lawful and expedient, not because their counterparts were used in the Temple, but because they help to kindle heart and voice in God's praise." Speaking of "the two great divergent theories of worship—the Ritual and the Puritan," he says, "the Ritual appeals to the senses, the Puritan to the soul." And no one at all interested in this discussion could wish for a better description of the rival theories than he gives. "In the one you have the *sight* of a gorgeous building and an altar blazing with light, the *sound* of bewitching music, the *smell* of incense, the *touch* of holy water, the *taste* of the wafer. In the other, in its purest form, you have the senses completely ignored, the forms of worship, such as they are, appealing straight to the intellect and the soul." This utterance of Mr. Curwen is, in my opinion, pre-eminently instructive. It not only describes the two opposite theories, but it depicts the two systems in their practical operation. Undesignedly it may be, but all the more forcibly, he exhibits not the nature only but the tendency of Ritualism, and he would be a prophet indeed who could say *when* the excesses of the one system could be checked and

(CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1888.

kept within bounds were the principle of the other system abandoned. "It needs but a little," says Mr. Spurgeon, "to degrade the Christian into a Ritualist, and still less to turn the Ritualist into a Romanist."

This leads me to speak of principles. Mr. Curwen again and again uses the word, either in the singular or the plural number. He speaks of the desirableness of "striving to discover the ultimate principles on which the application of music to worship rests," of "advocating the introduction of art," in so far as it serves the ends of worship, "upon the distinct basis of principle." And, again, "the ultimate principle on which the use of music in worship rests seems . . . to be in the highest sense utilitarian." On reading this conclusion, we had to remind ourselves of the precise topic which Mr. Curwen undertook to discuss; but, in its wider issues, the question must be discussed with respect primarily to the revealed will of God, in the interpretation of which there ought to be no such thing as a "utilitarian principle." "God," says Calvin, "in vindicating His own right, first proclaims that He is a jealous God, and will be a stern avenger if He is confounded with any false god; and thereafter defines what due worship is, in order that the human race may be kept in obedience." And regarding the necessity for the revelation of God's will, Isaac Taylor remarks—"It is just the relation of the infinite to the finite that must be expected to form the peculiar topics of Divine revelation." The discussion therefore should embrace such points as these—the nature of Divine worship; the parts or divisions of it; the Divine appointment of those parts, and the changes therein sanctioned in the Scriptures; more especially the subject of Divine praise, its nature, the medium of it, and the effect upon that medium consequent on the change of dispensation.

Mr. Curwen has "touched" some of this "higher ground," and I would use the space yet available to me in discussing one or two of the points to which he refers. A large question is opened up by an expression he uses more than once, "the ends of worship." He gives no distinct statement as to what he considers these "ends" to be, but we may gather this, inferentially at least, from some of his expressions. He says, for instance, that the use of instruments may "help to kindle heart and voice in God's praise." Also that music in worship, to be right and useful, "must quicken and deepen religious feeling, and aid in its expression;" further, that "any style of music, vocal or instrumental, which tends to lull us into the passive enjoyment of sweet sounds, is dangerous to worship." "Music," he adds, "must help worship, and indeed can help it, but music must never be a substitute for worship." The same point is touched in a reference he makes to the effect of bad congregational singing. "Who has not felt his spirit checked," doubtless in the "higher flights" of the soul, of which he had previously spoken, "and chilled when, after an inspiring sermon, the praise has fallen flat and coldly upon his ears?" And in another connection he says, "Let us remember that culture in music, divorced from the devotional spirit, is not only a mockery, but a failure."

From all this, an idea may be formed of what Mr. Curwen means by "the ends of worship," presuming that he had chiefly in view that part of it which is called praise. It were well, however, that in discussing the question in hand, there should be no dubiety in this respect. Theologians, I find, in treating of praise, always regard it as a part of prayer; partaking more or less of adoration, confession (in the sense of acknowledging God's dealings both in providence and in grace), and thanksgiving. Reference is made to the Psalms and other Scripture tributes of praise as combining all these elements. This aspect of praise should throw no little light upon the discussion of the present question. If praise be a part of prayer in its wider sense, then whatever may be predicated of the one exercise, in its one phase, may be predicated of the other. We attach to the exercise of prayer, holy awe or reverence, humility, devotion, a consciousness of dealing with Him who is expressly designated the hearer of prayer, and into whose presence we have immediate access through the mediation of Christ, and in praying we are

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

taught and helped by the Holy Spirit. It is no begging of the question, therefore, to assert that until praise can be shown to differ essentially from prayer, no greater freedom can be allowed in regard to the exercise of the one duty than of the other. Prayer is a transaction of the soul with God; so is praise. Prayer must be exercised under the influence of the Holy Spirit; so ought praise. Prayer is accepted only in and through the Great Mediator, so is praise. As, in prayer, there can be no worshipping of God through the medium of images and pictures; so in praise, no other medium is admissible than that of "heart and voice."

Mr. Curwen refers again and again to "the influence of the senses," a point intimately connected with that just noticed. Here, too, there is a lack of precision. Speaking of the Ritualist and the Puritan forms of worship, he describes the one as appealing to "the senses," and the other to "the soul." Both forms it seems are defective, but defective only because each is extreme; for "the senses must at least be conciliated, if the soul is to be set free for higher flights." Of good congregational singing he says, "It is like the sound of many waters, the hum that rises from a busy town, the strange murmur of the forest, perhaps but half musical, yet touching our hearts with a feeling that we cannot express but cannot resist." There is much more to the same effect—all, or mostly all, of the *subjective* kind. We miss any reference, or have but slight reference, to the *objective* aspect of praise worship. In other words, while we have a good deal said about the senses and the sensuous, we miss any direct allusion to that faith "without which it is impossible to please God." This is surely an oversight, even in discussing the minor point of "music-worship." Some more direct reference might have been made to this indispensable accompaniment of all acceptable worship—faith. Now, with our apprehension of what faith in such a connection is, we cannot conceive how the soul can be "set free for higher flights"—which we take to mean for communion with God, the great object of all true worship—"by the senses being conciliated." This result we believe to be produced by the exercise of faith; but here it is ascribed to the effect of music operating upon the senses—faith giving place to sense instead of triumphing over it. The music that effects this important result must be of the instrumental kind; for we are told that "the discovery" has been made "during the last thirty years." In contrast to this teaching, let us listen to the testimony of the Puritan Owen. "It is admitted that the exercise of saving faith—of that faith which is the fruit of the Spirit, and produces regeneration—is attended by feelings appropriate to its object; but this is to be referred to the nature of the object. If we believe a good report, the effect is joy; the perception of beauty produces delight,—of moral excellence, a glow of approbation; of spiritual things, in many cases a joy unspeakable and full of glory." It seems to have been John Owen's opinion that it is the exercise of faith that sets "the soul free for higher flights." But he did not ignore the senses. In another place he says, "the truths of revelation, though not the ground of our faith, do powerfully and rightly affect our feelings." We had marked off for quotation some passages in Canon Liddon's *Elements of Religion*, in which the relations of faith to feeling, and generally the emotional in religion, are discussed; but we can only refer to the volume.

Another point touched by Mr. Curwen, and which more immediately concerns his special topic, is that of "freely admitting art" into public worship; or, as he otherwise puts it, "satisfying our æsthetic sense." This we take to refer to the highest development of vocal music by the aid of instrumental accompaniments. Addressing the opponents of organs in churches, he says, "A negative attitude is not enough. You must have a positive policy, and show people that you can produce an unaccompanied service which satisfies the ear and the devotional feeling richly and deeply, falling like the echoes of a purer worship upon the weary and distracted spirit." This is the well-expressed utterance of a musical critic, but certainly the criticism of music apart from worship; and it induces the query, if it is not a mistake and a misnomer to speak thus of worship-music? In so far as Divine worship is concerned, the exercise referred to is praise—a word



[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, April, 1883.]

which Mr. Curwen seldom uses, always preferring that of "music." Now, it need scarcely be remarked that the terms are by no means synonymous. Praise, like prayer, may be "uttered or unexpressed," and, in the light of revelation, we may conclude that music, apart from the heart-worship, cannot be acceptable to God, however artistically offered. And this brings us face to face with the question as to whether the high ideal in church music set before us here is practically attainable; and if attainable, is it desirable? It may be taken for granted, that upon every Christian congregation rests the obligation to praise the Lord "skilfully." But considering the component and ever-varying parts of an ordinary congregation—consisting of young and old, cultured and uncultured, those who are joyful and others who are sad—can more be expected than that an honest and persistent effort be made to harmonise generally, voices and expressed emotions so varied? This, we think, is all that in the light of revelation seems to be obligatory. Not only so, but we think that the introduction of so-called "art" in public worship is not only unwarranted by Scripture, but likely, so far from aiding devotion, seriously to interfere with it. "The worship of God," says Owen, "is, or ought to be, the same at all times, in all places and amongst all people, in all nations; and the order of it is fixed and determined in all particulars that belong to it." He adds, "And let not man pretend the contrary until he can give an instance of any such defect in the institutions of Christ, as that the worship of God cannot be carried on without an addition of something of their own for the supply thereof."

Mr. Curwen's taste, however, is discriminating, and he gives us clearly to understand that the improvement of congregational singing is what he mainly seeks. His testimony to the very general desire for vocal praise throughout the country is of great importance. "That the singing should be congregational," he says, "is universally conceded. Wherever I speak on this subject, in England or elsewhere, among Churchmen or Nonconformists, I find a hearty and even enthusiastic assent to my assertion that in Divine worship the people ought themselves to sing." Choirs and organs he considers but as means to an end; that end being the best possible congregational singing. Good congregational singing he regards as far more likely to attract people to church than "musical performances." But it seems congregational singing is "difficult to get, and almost as difficult to keep when got," and so far from the organ necessarily improving the singing, he owns that it has often the opposite effect, and that the opposition of many to the introduction of the organ is quite reasonable, as they would rather bear the ills they have than fly to others that they know not of! This is a frank and valuable testimony. Mr. Curwen permits us to look behind the scenes, and we acknowledge to have got from him a clearer idea than we had before, of the immense labour required in order that "a full and harmonious offering of praise be maintained."

The effect of Mr. Curwen's paper upon my own mind has been to confirm my preference for unaided, that is unaccompanied, congregational singing. I could not but appreciate his keen and intelligent interest in the subject he discusses, and my sympathies go with him in a desire for increased and sustained improvement in the singing. But I stop far short of his ideal of excellence. As I have said, I believe it to be neither desirable nor attainable; and not desirable because of the injurious influence it would have on congregational devotion. Had he given more prominence to the theology of the question, I am convinced he would have done more justice to it. There are some who would make us believe that "the Church music question" is beyond discussion—that it is foreclosed. Mr. Curwen has come too much into contact with church life to share this conceit. He writes as one who knows that it is still a living, and with very many, a most important question, though, as we have seen, he regards the discussion not so much as it affects "worship-praise" as "worship-music."

M. S. TAIT.

GLASGOW.